

IV. He has attempted to undermine, circumvent, or annul the guarantees of the Bill of Rights—particularly the rights to privacy, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press—by: mounting an unprecedented campaign of harassment and vilification against the media of news and information; employing illegal wiretaps to spy on journalists and critics of his Administration; encouraging his aides to devise means of intimidating the media by use of governmental powers; embarking on political trials designed to silence those who dissented from his policies.

V. He has arrogated to himself powers not conferred by the Constitution, or powers expressly reserved to Congress, to wit: He has secretly, illegally, and deceptively ordered the bombing of a nation—Cambodia—without the knowledge or consent of the American people and their elected representatives; he has unlawfully impounded Federal funds totaling many millions of dollars that were duly appropriated by Congress in legislation he himself had signed; he has invoked a nebulous and dubious doctrine of "executive privilege" to withhold from the people information about the people's business.

VI. He has employed fraudulent schemes to muster—or create an appearance of—public support for his Administration's major policies, especially with respect to the unlawful invasion and bombing of Cambodia. These schemes have involved the placement of newspaper advertisements concocted in the White House, the generation of inspired letters and telegrams of support, and the manipulation of public opinion polls.

VII. He and his associates have conspired in sundry schemes to obstruct justice by: attempting to withhold evidence in criminal cases pertaining to the Watergate Affair; dismissing the Special Prosecutor, Archibald Cox; when he proved determined to do his job; tendering bribes to defendants and witnesses to induce them to remain silent or offer perjured testimony; persuading the former director of the FBI to destroy evidence; invoking "non-existing conflicts with CIA operations" to thwart an FBI inquiry; attempting to influence the judge in the Pentagon Papers trial; ordering the Attorney General not to press a series of antitrust actions against the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation.

VIII. He has subverted the integrity of various Federal agencies by sanctioning efforts to: bring about a reversal of the Agriculture Department's policy on dairy price supports to accommodate major campaign contributors; involve the CIA and the FBI in unlawful operations associated with the operations of the "plumbers;" exert pressure on independent regulatory agencies to hand down decisions favorable to his friends and supporters; employ the Internal Revenue Service to punish his "enemies."

IX. He has conducted his personal affairs in a manner that directly contravenes the traditional Presidential obligation to demonstrate "moral leadership," to wit: He has used substantial amounts of the taxpayers' money to pay for certain improvements and maintenance of his private homes—expenditures that can in no way be related to secu-

rity requirements or any other public purpose; he has taken advantage of every tax loophole permitted by law—and some of doubtful legality—to diminish his own tax obligations; he has entered into questionable arrangements with his friends to acquire large personal property holdings at minimal cost to himself; he has publicly and emphatically defended one of these friends, G. C. (Bebe) Rebozo, at a time when various Federal agencies were conducting supposedly impartial investigations into his financial affairs.

X. He has attempted to deceive the American people with respect to virtually every particular cited in this Bill of Impeachment, by withholding information and evidence; by misstating the facts when they could no longer be totally suppressed; by constantly changing his version of the facts, so that the people could no longer place any credibility whatever in statements emanating from the Chief Executive of their Government, to the point where it now seems doubtful that he would be believed even if he were to begin, miraculously, to tell the truth.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 12 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second? [Putting the question.]

There is a sufficient second. The yeas and nays are ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion to adjourn. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) is absent because of illness.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT) are necessarily absent.

Also, the Senator from Oregon (Mr.

HATFIELD), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. McCURE) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD) are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 78, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 547 Leg.]

YEAS—78

Abourezk	Dominick	Mondale
Aiken	Eastland	Montoya
Allen	Ervin	Moss
Bartlett	Fannin	Muskie
Bayh	Fong	Nelson
Beall	Gravel	Nunn
Bellmon	Griffin	Pastore
Bennett	Hansen	Pell
Bentsen	Hart	Proxmire
Bible	Hartke	Ribicoff
Biden	Haskell	Roth
Brock	Hathaway	Schweiker
Brooke	Helms	Scott, Hugh
Buckley	Hollings	Sparkman
Burdick	Hruska	Stafford
Byrd	Huddleston	Stennis
Harry F., Jr.	Humphrey	Stevens
Byrd, Robert C.	Inouye	Stevenson
Cannon	Jackson	Talmadge
Case	Johnston	Thurmond
Church	Kennedy	Tower
Clark	Long	Tunney
Cook	Magnuson	Welcker
Cranston	Mansfield	Williams
Curtis	McGovern	Young
Dole	McIntyre	
Domenici	Metcalf	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—22

Baker	Hughes	Percy
Chiles	Javits	Randolph
Cotton	Mathias	Saxbe
Eagleton	McClellan	Scott,
Fulbright	McClure	William L.
Goldwater	McGee	Symington
Gurney	Packwood	Taft
Hatfield	Pearson	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. Moss). On this vote there are 78 yeas and 0 nays. The motion to adjourn having been agreed to, the Senate stands in adjournment until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

Thereupon, at 11:58 a.m., the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 3, 1973, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR ARTISTS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, in 1969 Congress passed legislation which effectively eliminated tax deductions which

could be taken by artists and authors for contributions of their original works. This change in the tax law has resulted in the sharp curtailment of contributions of literary and artistic works to museums, libraries, and universities.

Mr. Rubin L. Gorewitz of New York City, in an article in "Art in America," discusses the impact of this tax law change and compares three bills which have been introduced in the House to restore tax deductions for artists. Mr.

Gorewitz observes, by way of illustration, that the 1969 legislation resulted in the loss to the Library of Congress of the collected works of composer Igor Stravinsky, valued at \$3.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of this article:

ARTISTS/IRS: A MODEST PROPOSAL

(By Rubin L. Gorewitz)

In 1969 Congress passed legislation that has significantly affected artists and art

institutions throughout the country. Effective January 1, 1970, the Internal Revenue Code was amended so that artists, among others, could no longer deduct from their income tax the full value of their own works when contributed to tax-exempt organizations. While gifts by collectors are still deductible at the fair market value of the work the artist who contributes his or her work of art and deduct only the actual cost of the work—paint, canvas, etc. This change in the tax law was highly discriminatory in that it singled out one small group of taxpayers—artists. The resulting increase in tax revenues was extremely insignificant.

The new law states that any individual or business will benefit only to the extent of the cost of the donation rather than, as before, the fair market sales price. The point, however, is that costs of items differ substantially. An auto manufacturer, for instance, may deduct all his costs, including labor, materials overhead, etc. A creative artist, however now may deduct only his out-of-pocket expenses, with no allowance made for his own labor—since he can't pay himself a taxable deductible salary.

At present a full value contribution is received after the artist's death, when his heirs may deduct the sales price of the contributed object. Any saving the artist would have realized in his lifetime will be realized after his death. So Internal Revenue doesn't actually receive more taxes, but merely defers the dates when the tax benefit is received. If the artist were granted this benefit when alive, it would enable him to practice his profession more fully with no adverse tax consequences to Internal Revenue.

In order to encourage more contributions, the Tax Reform Act of 1969 increased allowable deductions from 30 percent to 50 percent of the donor's adjusted gross income, a clause which has no bearing on the artist's particular situation. Since it is the worthwhile intent of the government to encourage contributions to tax-exempt foundations, it is perhaps an oversight for Congress to have introduced a tax provision that discourages those made by artists. Stravinsky, for instance, put his own manuscripts on the market, though he had intended to give them to the Library of Congress. The \$3.5-million collection, if given to the Library, would have been deductible only to the value of paper and ink.

At present there are three tax bills pending in the House Ways and Means Committee, all intended to ease this situation. The most liberal (H.R. 2151) has been introduced by Congressman Ogden Reid (D-N.Y.); it reinstates the old law without removing any of the inequities. The most conservative, introduced by Congressman Wilbur Mills (D-Ark.), is H.R. 3152; it would allow a deduction of only 50 percent of the art work's fair market value and then only if the recipient of the contribution submits a written statement that "the donated property represents material of historical or artistic significance, and the use by the donee will be related to the purpose or function constituting the basis for its exemption."

The compromise version (H.R. 6764), submitted by Congressman John Brademas (D-Ind.), attempts to eliminate the inequities of the previous law. Basically, the bill allows the artist to deduct 75 percent of the fair market value of the contribution *only* if the artist's gross income from the sale of his works is equal to the amount contributed. For example, if an artist has a gross income of \$10,000 from the sale of his art works, he may then contribute up to \$10,000 in art works.

The Brademas bill, like the Mills bill, also requires a written statement from the recipient. The Brademas bill, however, prohibits contributions by hobbyists—people who do not earn any income as artists, but who make deductions on their tax return for contributed works. Despite the fact that this would

have ranked Van Gogh as a hobbyist, it seems a reasonable way of separating the amateur from the professional.

Both Mills' and Brademas' bills prohibit any public officeholder from contributing "any letter, memorandum or similar property by or for an individual while he held an office under the government of the United States or any state or political subdivision thereof, if the writing, preparation or production of such property was related to, or arose out of, the performance of the duties of such office." This directly relates to one of the reasons the original law was changed in the first place. Contributions made by President Johnson to his library in Texas, and by President Nixon to the National Archives in 1969, afforded considerable tax relief for both presidents—a quarter of a million dollars in President Nixon's case.

A DANGER IN PEACE

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, in a time of continual crisis, often only the front page item gets enough attention for action. The energy crisis is a case in point.

Two wise editorials in a recent *Forbes* magazine trace the early warnings of the crisis, the national distraction to other matters, and the explosion of the energy issue into the front page slot because of war.

The editorials also worry about our fate should we neglect to get our energy house in order before the next crisis knocks on the door and steals the thunder. It is a worry I share.

I would like to reprint these editorials at this time.

The editorials follow:

OIL IS NOT WELL

A little over two years ago *Forbes* (Aug. 1, 1971) foresaw many of the energy and raw materials shortages that are making headlines today. The article, sharply written by Senior Editor James Cook, didn't say that the Arabs would precipitate a major crisis by shutting off the oil. But it did say that this could happen. "The hand on the oil pump," we warned, "can be the hand that strangles our economy."

We weren't the only ones to see what was coming. The press and the dinner-speaker circuits were full of such warnings.

What happened after that, after the clarification call had been sounded and the public aroused? Well, nothing happened. Nothing happened because the next week and the next month there were other alarms. The environmental crisis and the economic crisis and the war crisis and the drug crisis. We tossed and turned and worried about a lot of things other than energy. In 1971 we worried about airline hijacking, the Pentagon papers, President Nixon's Phase I price freeze and the first dollar devaluation.

We spent 1972 preoccupied with the mining of Haiphong harbor, the sinking dollar, our polluted environment and Watergate. Some of us worried about Nixon staying in power, but a majority of us shuddered at the thought of a President McGovern.

And this year has been devoted to more Watergate and political scandal, leading up to the resignation of the Vice President.

What happened to the energy crisis from 1971 to the day King Faisal turned off the oil faucet? It landed in the back of your newspaper, near the corset ads and the steam-

ship schedules. It took a war to bring it back to the front page.

The problem, it seems, is that the world is spinning too fast these days. Anything that isn't nailed down in our consciousness just flies away. Alvin Toffler dubbed the phenomenon future shock—"the dizzying disorientation" caused by accelerating change.

This then is the main problem: How do we all assure that our critical energy problem isn't shelved again? "My fear," says energy expert Dr. Bruce Netschert of the National Economic Research Associates, "is that the Arabs will lift the oil embargo soon and the public will forget the problem and go back to normal. No one wants to face the fact that we are critically vulnerable on energy. I feel the public will have to be forced to face the problem."

We're trying to do our share of "forcing" the issue.

THE GOAL IS SELF-SUFFICIENCY—IN SOME WAYS WE'LL BE BETTER OFF IF THE ENERGY CRISIS DOESN'T GO AWAY

A good many thoughtful Americans are saying privately that they hope the Arabs don't let the U.S. off the oil hook, at least not soon. For if they ease up soon, then the U.S. public may settle back and again luxuriate in the illusion of plentiful oil—until the next time the U.S. or its friends displease the Arab world.

President Nixon says we can be self-sufficient again by 1980. But achieving that goal depends on many things. Such as American willingness to spend at least \$40 billion in tax money and business profits for research and development. A willingness to pay considerably higher prices to finance the horrendous costs of coal gasification, drilling on the continental shelf, and extracting oil from shale and tar sand. It also depends on a spirit of compromise on ecology and pollution.

The dreadful alternative is a more lopsided dependence on Arab oil.

It took a long time for the U.S. to become dependent. Getting self-sufficient won't be easy, cheap or fast. But it will be one of the smartest things this nation has ever done.

How did we get into this fix? It's a long story.

The Federal Government, way back in 1954, slapped on rock-bottom price limits on natural gas which assured low utility rates and runaway demand, while discouraging exploration for fresh supplies. Then, as oil became harder to find at home, domestic drilling skidded to a 21-year low in 1971.

At the same time, the Government retarded experimentation on synthetic fuels—such as gas from coal, oil from shale and electricity from sunlight. The sparse research dollars went toward the long-term solution of nuclear power. Russell Train, who is administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, recalls: "Time and again I tried to convince the Budget Bureau that R&D dollars were vital for coal gasification and so on. Time and again, they said: 'Forget it, the cost benefit isn't good.'"

As this indicates, our Government hasn't had a cohesive energy policy. It still doesn't.

The oil industry deserves plenty of blame. Most of it was mesmerized by that cheap Middle Eastern oil. "Be nice to the Arabs," it pleaded. But how nice? To the point of allowing Arab armies to sweep over a weakened Israel? And who was to be certain that a reasonable man like King Faisal might not one day be replaced by a wild man like Colonel Qaddafi?

Oil expert M. A. Adelman claims that the multinational oil companies have become tax collectors for the Mideast producing nations.

The point is that the Arabs have every right to use their economic power. But remember, their interests and ours will not always coincide.

At the same time, most majors also turned their backs on the potential of high-priced but domestic-made synthetic fuels. In all, the oil industry devotes a measly 0.07% of its \$80 billion in sales to R&D—that's all R&D—plus only 2% to worldwide exploration and drilling.

What's more, 23 of the largest oil companies own 10% of our coal reserves and 50% of our uranium—some of the very resources that could be converted to clean energy.

Chris Welles, author of a controversial book on oil shale, says: "For years the oil industry has retarded oil shale experimentation for fear that an independent and competitive energy industry would spring up and undercut the conventional oil business."

The oil companies' response is rather lame. In effect, they want profit guarantees before they'll search for oil at home. They are on solid ground when they blame some of the shortage on politicians and overzealous environmentalists.

Now we have a name for it: the energy crisis. Actually, it has been with us all along. It will remain a crisis as long as the U.S. is dependent on outside sources for something as vital as energy fuels.

POW'S—DON'T LET THEM BE FORGOTTEN

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in recent months the American people have had to cope with many confusing and chaotic problems and events. Many Americans have become disillusioned with the leadership of our country. The war in the Middle East has dampened our vision of universal freedom for all mankind. And now, we as Americans, are facing what may be the crisis of our lives—the critical need to conserve and protect our precious natural resources. These issues have been the forefront of public attention in past months, and rightfully so—but as a result many equally important issues have been "side tracked" and ignored by many.

I would now like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues once again the all too often ignored plight of our men still missing in Southeast Asia. Many Americans have forgotten that there are still 1,200 men missing in action in Southeast Asia—men who served with bravery and distinction when called upon by their country—men who now seem to have been forgotten. This greatly disturbs me. The war, for these men, and for their families and loved ones, still continues day in and day out. Imagine, if you can, what it must be like living each day while still not knowing what has happened to one's brother, son, or husband. Imagine the torment of trying to resolve things in one's own mind while not knowing what has happened to a loved one—and the disillusionment of trying to accept the fact that one may never really ever know.

These are disturbing thoughts—thoughts that many would probably rather hide and forget. But the fact remains, the men who served our country in Southeast Asia and who are still miss-

ing in action are still alive in the hearts of many. Let us constantly remind ourselves of this fact, and let all make a dedicated commitment to ourselves and to the American people we represent, that we will do all in our power to find our missing men and hopefully help to obtain a speedy reunion with their loved ones.

On Sunday, November 4, 1973, the city of Quincy, Mass., dedicated a tree in honor of Air Force Capt. Charles Bifolchi of Quincy who is missing in action in Southeast Asia. This type of a memorial is, I believe, a fitting reminder of what freedom is, for as a tree struggles to grow, so does freedom. If a tree does not struggle, it will die. So, too, will freedom.

So let us remind ourselves that, while we are all concerned with the problems which we perceive as being more immediate, the struggle of our men missing in action to achieve their freedom still continues. Such a struggle is no less immediate than some of the other problems we are currently facing, for the struggle to be free lies at the very heart of our national heritage. If such a struggle is forgotten, we will lose all that we have.

THE LATE HONORABLE TOM PELLY

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1973

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in this tribute today to the memory of Thomas M. Pelly, whose passing has left me shocked and saddened. He was a respected colleague and a dear friend. He brought to the Congress long cherished principles of unfaltering integrity and an uncanny ability to judge which issues would be of importance to future generations. Tom Pelly was instrumental in shaping legislation within the areas of conservation, maritime, and fisheries. I often relied on his astute analysis of measures in these and other areas.

Prior to retirement last year, he served as the ranking minority member of the Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. He was recognized as an authority on the work of the Science and Astronautics Committee.

As Tom's colleague for over a decade, I at times found him in amiable disagreement with me on how best to approach some of the critical problems facing our Nation. But I always had great admiration for the depth of his integrity and I knew that his views were formulated only after careful study and deliberation.

Before coming to this Chamber, Tom served as president of the chamber of commerce in Seattle and as a director of both a local bank and an insurance company. In spare moments he managed to take a leading role in many civic organizations. Tom had always chosen the role of leadership for the good of his community, and later in his congressional career employed his leadership for the good of this Nation.

My deepest sympathy is extended to Tom's gracious wife, Mary and to their two children and their families. Tom Pelly's illustrious life will certainly serve as a source of family pride for future generations.

In the midst of sadness on this day, one ray of joy does penetrate through: That the memory of Tom Pelly, the man and his countless accomplishments, will be an inspiration to those of us who knew him.

WHY SOME PRICES SHOULD RISE

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I submitted an article from the Wall Street Journal for the Members' attention entitled "Rationing is Irrational." Today, I am continuing my efforts to convince my colleagues that the only solution to encouraging the production of the vital commodities that are in short supply in our domestic economy is to repeal the so-called Economic Stabilization Act, and allow the free enterprise system to work.

No doubt one of the most critical shortages we have encountered is in our supply of fuel. In an article which appeared in the November 19, 1973, issue of Newsweek, Dr. Milton Friedman, a leading monetarist, supports the only rational approach to the fuel crisis.

The most effective way to cut consumption and encourage production is simply to let the prices of oil products rise to whatever level it takes to clear the market. The higher prices would give each of the 210 million residents of the U.S. a direct incentive to economize on oil, to find substitutes for oil, to increase the supply of oil.

Mr. Speaker, today I met with local officials from three suburban Los Angeles cities—Burbank, Glendale, and Pasadena. These officials have been advised by their current suppliers that they will no longer be furnished with low-sulfur fuel oil after this year. This residual fuel is used to operate the powerplants for these cities. It is clear to me that the controls have not encouraged the production of fuel, and allocations will not result in increased production. Production incentive is rooted in a free market economy.

I urge my colleagues to carefully study Dr. Friedman's following article with the hope that we can unite now to repeal ESA, and allow the free market forces to bring us back to being a land of plenty:

WHY SOME PRICES SHOULD RISE (by Milton Friedman)

"When the price of a thing goes up," wrote the British economist Edwin Cannan, in 1915, "a good many people . . . abuse, not the buyers nor the persons who might produce it and do not do so, but the persons who are producing and selling it, and thereby keeping down its price . . . It certainly would appear to be an extraordinary example of the proverbial ingratitude of man when he abuses the farmer who does grow

wheat because other farmers do not... But have we not all heard the preacher abuse his congregation because it is so small?"

This ancient article, from which I have taken my title, has been brought to mind by the oil crisis.

Time and again, I have castigated the oil companies for their hypocrisy, for loudly proclaiming their allegiance to free enterprise yet simultaneously undermining free enterprise by seeking and getting special governmental privilege (percentage depletion, prorationing of oil, import quotas, etc.). Yet we shall only hurt ourselves if we let resentment at their past misdeeds interfere with our adopting the most effective way to meet the present problem.

VOLUNTARY COOPERATION

The current oil crisis has not been produced by the oil companies. It is a result of governmental mismanagement exacerbated by the Mideast war. The price of natural gas at the wellhead has been held down for years by government edict. Since Aug. 15, 1971, the price of retail gasoline and of fuel oil has been held down by the successive phases. The result has been to encourage consumption and discourage both current production and the expansion of capacity. It took the Mideast war to bring these evil effects of price-fixing to a boil.

If all Mideast oil is shut off, we shall have to do without some 10 per cent of our present oil supplies. That is no tragedy. It means going back to the rate of consumption of 1970 or 1971—when no one thought we had a catastrophic shortage of fuel.

The most effective way to cut consumption and encourage production is simply to let the prices of oil products rise to whatever level it takes to clear the market. The higher prices would give each of the 210 million residents of the U.S. a direct incentive to economize on oil, to find substitutes for oil, to increase the supply of oil.

How much will the price have to rise? No one can tell. But if consumption must be cut by 10 percent, it is hard to believe the price would have to rise by more than, say, double that percentage. A 20 per cent rise in oil and gasoline prices would not be nice—but consider the alternative.

CHANCE, FAVORITISM, BRIBERY?

The only alternative is exhortation backed by compulsion: artificially low prices accompanied by governmental rationing. This method induces each of us to oppose the general interest rather than to further it. Our separate incentive is to wangle as much as we can from the rationing authorities. And they can have only the crudest criteria to know how to distribute the limited supplies. They have no way to know whose "need" is genuine and whose is artificial—even if we put to one side, as experience warns us we cannot, special influence, corruption and bribery.

Two hundred and ten million persons each with a separate incentive to economize; or 210 million persons dragooned by men with guns to cut down their use of oil—can there be any doubt which is the better system?

But, you will say, rationing by price hurts the poor relative to the rich. What of the poor man with his old jalopy as the only way to get to work? The answer is straightforward. If high oil prices impose special problems on some, let us provide funds to mitigate their problem. Let us not impose compulsion and waste on 95 per cent to avoid special measures for 5 per cent.

Note that what is called for is higher prices for oil products relative to other products—not general inflation. Only some prices should rise.

The oil problem offers a particularly clear illustration of how the price system promotes both freedom and efficiency, how it enables millions of us to cooperate voluntarily with one another in our common interest. It brings out equally why the only alternative

to the price system is compulsion and the use of force.

It is a mark of how far we have gone on the road to serfdom that governmental allocation and rationing of oil is the automatic response to the oil crisis. This will not prevent higher prices, which will in fact do the job—but you may be sure that the rationing authorities will take the credit.

RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE: AN INTERVIEW WITH JOHN SUMMERS, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in a recently televised interview, I discussed pay TV with Mr. John Summers, counsel for the National Association of Broadcasters. I insert the text of that interview at this point:

YOU'VE A RIGHT TO KNOW: NOVEMBER 7, 1973,
PAY-TV, AN INTERVIEW WITH MR. SUMMERS

Congressman RARICK. Pay television, a broadcast entertainment system whereby individual TV programs are paid for by the viewer watching them, has generated some degree of controversy among TV broadcasters and here in Congress. It's been the subject of several congressional hearings and numerous legislative proposals, as well as many Federal Communications Commission proceedings. We'll discuss pay-TV today, along with free TV, cable TV, to determine how they relate to you as a television viewer, because you've a right to know.

With me on the program today is John Summers, Counsel for the National Association of Broadcasters. Its members represent commercial television and radio stations across our country. Mr. Summers, the NAB has been running full page newspaper ads lately about pay TV. To begin with, I think we might get some definitions straight. What is the difference between over-the-air TV, cable TV, and pay-TV?

Mr. SUMMERS. Well, Congressman, at the risk of oversimplification, I would say first that over-the-air TV is the TV that the public is well familiar with. The television station transmits a signal over the air, and it's received by the home antenna and brings a picture into your living room. Cable TV is a distribution system for retransmitted signals which uses wire connections to the home. In other words, the cable system picks a signal off the air and then distributes it by wire to various homes that subscribe to the cable television system. Now, pay-TV is more of a service. It can be distributed by various means. Two means may be used today. One is the over-the-air method using a scrambled over-the-air transmission which is received by the home TV set via special equipment in the home. The other method is to simply take one of the cable television systems channels and distribute the pay-TV program on that channel. Now, I think that the threat of pay-TV that we're concerned about is the threat using existing cable television systems.

RARICK. Then, under both pay and cable TV, the individual subscriber, the man with the TV set, would still have to pay in order to receive his programs, is that correct?

SUMMERS. That's right; he would.

RARICK. They are almost the same thing, aren't they?

SUMMERS. Well cable and pay-TV are the same thing in some cases, but not in all. In other words, if you subscribe to a cable TV system, you pay a fee every month, which is

called a subscriber fee. Now, if that cable system has a pay-TV channel, then obviously you pay an additional fee every month for the pay-TV services that are offered.

RARICK. Well, I understand that both pay-TV and cable are requesting changes in the FCC regulations. Concerning the programming, can you point out what some of these changes are?

SUMMERS. Yes, without getting too complex, there are FCC rules at the present time which restrict the programs that can be carried by pay-TV or by over-the-air pay-TV. One restriction is on sports programs and another is on movies, feature films. Now, the cable people, without going into those complex rules, want to either relax or do away with those restrictions all together, so that they could in effect, bring to the public for a fee, the same programs, sports or films, that the public now sees for free over free TV.

RARICK. If the FCC agrees to these changes, what effect would they have on the present commercial TV?

SUMMERS. It would have a great effect upon free TV, because it simply wouldn't have the product to offer to the public, and of course, in the long run, the real effect would be on the public itself. I think a good illustration would be the World Series. At the present time, pay-TV could not show the World Series unless it had not been shown on free television for the past two years. Assuming that that rule did not exist, the pay-TV people would be free to bid against the networks for the rights to the World Series. Now, those rights presently cost about 10 million dollars; that's what the networks pay for the rights to bring the public the World Series via free television. There are about 8 million homes today hooked up to cable systems in this country. Now, if the pay-TV people could get just two or three million of those homes to pay for the World Series, say at five dollars for the whole World Series, then they would have enough money right there to outbid the networks for the World Series, and therefore, the World Series would then be taken off free television and would be available only for a fee on pay-TV.

RARICK. I think many Americans find themselves facing the same situation that I occasionally do. We have one day free on a weekend. I found myself last weekend here in Washington with a Sunday to myself, and with eleven television stations in the District of Columbia area, I couldn't find one station that had one program on the entire weekend that I felt was entertaining. In other words, the broadcasters want to tell me what they feel is entertaining, but they very often have no appeal to me as a specific listener. Wouldn't pay-TV then give the viewer additional freedom of choice, to secure his own entertainment?

SUMMERS. Yes, I think it would. And I think I should explain that the National Association of Broadcasters has no objection to pay-TV itself. If pay-TV can offer the viewer something which is not available on free television, some minority taste program such as ballet, opera, Broadway, or what-have-you, then we have no objection to pay-TV at all. What we object to is the capacity of pay-TV to siphon off, if I may use that term, to siphon off from free television those programs that the public now sees on free television.

RARICK. Let me say this, last weekend, if I had eleven television channels I was paying for, I would have cancelled my subscription. I think many times that the people responsible for national TV programming don't realize if they don't deliver programs that keep the people's interest (rather than the officials at the FCC) then people lose all interest in television as a medium of entertainment.

SUMMERS. That's right, and if I could interject something, that's why we are so con-

cerned about this issue, because I think it's been illustrated that the type of programming which has the most appeal for the public is sports and movies. And we're afraid that the pay-TV people will not be concerned about the minority interest type programming you just mentioned that you might be interested in on a particular weekend. We're afraid that they will go after what we call the "mass appeal" programming, the sports and the movies that people now see for free.

RARICK. But of course, people could turn to pay-TV for the, as you say, non-mass-entertainment type programming and then still go back to news and sports on the free TV, could they not? The point I'm trying to make is, if pay-TV doesn't deliver a service, it isn't going to get people to pay for the programming.

SUMMERS. I think that's true.

RARICK. So they will almost have to come up with a programming appeal that will reach the mainstream of American people.

SUMMERS. Well, I would hate to see them come up with that sort of programming at the expense of the public which now sees, the sports and movies for free, and have pay-TV outbid the networks and stations for that programming and end up with a situation where the public has to pay for what it now sees for free.

RARICK. Well, if the public doesn't like what it sees for free, it's really not free. It's costing the public because they have lost a valuable tool of entertainment and relaxation. As I say, I may be different from a lot of people. I travel too much and am too busy, but when I do have a rare chance to watch TV I may not be able to find even one program that is entertaining. We hear complaints from consumer groups about "commercial clutter" on television. Would we also have this commercial clutter and "public service spots" on pay-TV?

SUMMERS. At the present time, the Commission's rules do not allow commercials on pay-TV programs that cable systems carry.

RARICK. They are prohibited then?

SUMMERS. They're prohibited at this time. But I don't think we have any assurance that in the future there will not be commercials on pay-TV programs, and I say this because if the cable pay-TV people are able to siphon off the most popular programs, the sports and the movies, and you suddenly have a market in terms of households viewing these programs—say of eight or ten million people—then I just don't think the advertisers are going to allow that kind of audience to sit there without trying to sell something to them.

RARICK. What about public service announcements? We're seeing more and more here, especially areas on commercial TV.

SUMMERS. I would not assume that there would be public service announcements on pay-TV programs at all.

RARICK. Of course commercial television is required to carry a certain amount of this public service time. This rule comes from the FCC, so we can't really say that it would not be imposed on pay-TV in the future could we?

SUMMERS. No, I guess we couldn't. I wouldn't anticipate that they would carry public service announcements, but you never can be sure when you have a regulated industry.

RARICK. You've indicated that pay-TV is already in existence in some size in the United States. Do you feel that there is definitely a possibility of a growing pay-TV network system in the United States today?

SUMMERS. Oh, I think so. I think we'll have some form of pay-TV for some time to come. I think the question is, what sort of programming will that pay-TV system offer? Will it offer the public something different, something innovative, something that they can't see now on free over-the-air television? Or will it simply duplicate and eventually re-

move from free TV those popular programs, sports and movies, that people now see without charge on free TV?

RARICK. It would also depend a great deal what special legislation Congress gives them or the regulation FCC would see fit to extend to pay-TV then.

SUMMERS. That's right. We would hope that at some point Congress would step in and determine just what form pay-TV is going to take in this country.

RARICK. Well, we thank you very much, Mr. John Summers, Counsel for the National Association of Broadcasters, for being our guest today.

EMBARGO OF EXPORTS OF PETROCHEMICALS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the Members of the House, as well as to the American people in general, the severe shortages many American businessmen are now experiencing with certain raw materials, particularly petrochemicals and other byproducts of crude oil.

Of course the recent Arab oil black-mail effort has added to the problem. But even before the recent Arab-Israel conflict began in early October, shortages were being experienced in almost every aspect of industry where petrochemicals are a substantial ingredient of production.

Why has this happened? In the first place, production of petrochemicals and other oil byproducts has for several years lagged far behind consumption; or, to put it another way, we are demanding and using much more petrochemicals than we are producing. Not only has this reduced existing stockpiles and led to shortages, but it has caused prices to skyrocket.

Coming on the heels of shortages and higher prices have been price controls instituted by the Cost-of-Living Council. This, in turn, has led to further shortages as producers understandably prefer to sell their goods overseas, where price controls do not apply. Further, the need for the United States to better its balance-of-trade status in the world economic community has strengthened the desire to continue to export as many goods as possible.

However, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is now time—it may be too late for some American workers already—to rethink our position with regard to permitting exportation of petrochemicals to continue while prices are frozen at their present levels.

In my view, at least two steps must be taken immediately:

First, it is absolutely necessary for the Secretary of Commerce to use whatever authority he has under the Export Administration Act to place an embargo on all petrochemicals and oil byproducts. I have written to the Secretary and asked him to do so and would hope that he will cut through the usual redtape surrounding an embargo procedure.

Second, it is absolutely necessary for the Cost-of-Living Council to quickly amend its price controls regulations on petrochemicals. I have previously called on the Council to take action with respect to other matters and have not been pleased with their responses; nevertheless, I am calling on the Council again, this time to respond quickly to what is becoming a serious situation.

I fully realize that an embargo carries with it problems for the exporters of the country, but in my view the need to keep plants and businesses open and the need to avoid job cutbacks and layoffs is paramount. With regard to the question of the country's balance of trade, I quote from a letter written to me by Martin Stone, who is chairman of the board of Monogram Industries in Los Angeles:

It is particularly shortsighted to applaud the improvement in our balance of trade brought about by rapidly increasing sales of chemicals when at the same time American plants are being shut down and deprived of the opportunity to export not the chemicals themselves but the final end product which would carry a much higher ultimate dollar value.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Secretary of Commerce can act speedily. I would hope that the Cost-of-Living Council will reexamine and revise their price guidelines with regard to petrochemicals immediately. I know that the gears of the Government grind slowly, but it seems to me that we are playing the game under much different rules than we were even 2 short months ago. The times now call for quick and definitive action, for a willingness to abandon time consuming procedures, and for speedy resolution of problems. I would hope that these two agencies can meet this challenge.

Finally, I would urge the Congress to give speedy approval to a bill, H.R. 11410, introduced by my colleague from Connecticut, Congressman SARASIN, which would require the Secretary to place an embargo on petrochemicals immediately.

STATUTORY SPECIAL PROSECUTOR—AN EXECUTIVE APPOINTEE

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, very soon the House is expected to consider legislation to establish by statute an Office of Special Prosecutor for the Watergate-related cases. Like most Members of Congress, I keenly felt the trauma our Nation experienced following the summary removal of Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox. There is no question but that public confidence in the Special Prosecutor's ability to conduct a thorough and impartial inquiry will be enhanced by the Congress creating a statutory office.

Essential to the credibility and integrity of the Watergate investigations are the powers granted to the Special Prosecutor. He must have the ability to

pursue evidence wherever it may lead and to have made available to him the documents and records he requires. Essential, too, is that the Special Prosecutor have the maximum degree of independence that the Congress can legally prescribe. Without a guarantee against summary dismissal, the American people will not have confidence in his investigation.

The House, like the Senate, is divided over whether the Prosecutor should be an Executive or a Judicial appointee. H.R. 11401, reported out by the House Judiciary Committee, directs the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, to appoint a panel of three District judges and empowers the panel to both select the Special Prosecutor and have sole power over his removal. The Dennis substitute vests in the Attorney General appointment of the Special Prosecutor and circumscribes the conditions for removal. The powers granted the Special Prosecutor are identical in both measures. Likewise, both the committee bill and the substitute create a statutory office for a term of 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, along with many colleagues, I originally favored placing the office in the courts, but the drafting of legislation has raised serious constitutional issues. Prosecutorial functions have traditionally been in the Executive and placing the office outside the Executive involves the risk of invalidating indictments should the legislation later be adjudged unconstitutional. Having a court empowered to both appoint and fire the prosecutor would appear to violate fundamental due process. For these reasons, I support the Dennis substitute.

The constitutional issue is whether or not the prosecutorial functions can validly be placed outside the Executive. The enforcement and prosecution of the laws is an executive function. The Supreme Court has consistently ruled that prosecution of offenses against the United States is solely an executive function, stemming from the power vested in the President by article II, section 3 of the Constitution. *Ponzi v. Fessenden*, 258 U.S. 254 (1922); *Springer v. Phillipine Islands*, 277 U.S. 189 (1928). What is being proposed in H.R. 11401 has no precedent in the Federal judicial system and would appear to violate the principle of separation of powers.

H.R. 11401 places in the courts the power of removal of an Executive officer. This conflicts with the intent of *Myers v. United States*, 272 U.S. 52 (1926). *Myers* is a landmark case in constitutional law, which recognizes the principle that a President has the sole power to remove purely Executive officers. The rationale of this case is the President's right to control subordinates responsible for carrying out his obligation to faithfully execute the laws. By placing the appointment power in the Attorney General rather than in the President, the Dennis substitute permits the Congress to severely restrict the possibility of removal of the prosecutor. This approach is consistent with the *Myers* decision and with *U.S. v. Perkins*, 116 U.S. 483 (1886).

Proponents of H.R. 11401 cite *U.S. v.*

Solomon, 216 F. Supp. 835 (1963) as authority for judge-appointed prosecutors. But this is a misreading of the scope of *Solomon*. That case concerned the validity of a Federal statute authorizing a temporary appointment of an U.S. attorney by the chief judge of a U.S. district court, where a vacancy occurs by reason of death or resignation. But unlike H.R. 11401, the U.S. attorney so appointed remained a member of the executive branch, subject to the direction of the Attorney General and subject to replacement and removal by the President at any time.

Mr. Speaker, as in many constitutional issues, there are arguments on both sides. Clearly, however, if we go the route of court-appointed Special Prosecutor, we run the risk that the justice we all seek may be frustrated. The damage to our society if this should occur should give pause to all Members of the House. The Dennis substitute offers a legal means of achieving the needed statutory independence and powers in the office of Special Prosecutor that the American people seek.

THE DRUG LAG

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I read with deep concern an article in the October issue of the Reader's Digest which suggests our country is facing a "mounting emergency" in the timely development and introduction of new medical discoveries.

"The Medicines We Need—But Don't Have," written by Walter Ross, makes a disturbing case that our citizens are being deprived, for years in some instances, of safe and effective drugs that are being widely and successfully used in advanced countries abroad.

The fundamental cause, the Digest article asserts, is that this country's regulatory agency, the Food and Drug Administration, has taken "the seedling" of the drug effectiveness amendment that we in Congress enacted in 1962 and "cultivated it into a mighty bureaucratic tree that sprouts regulations and paperwork in all seasons."

This thought-provoking article tells of recent efforts by a group of distinguished American medical scientists led by Dr. Robert Dripps of the University of Pennsylvania to sound the alarm about this disturbing drug lag. I understand Dr. Dripps and his associates have repeatedly expressed their concern to our own distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida, chairman of our Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment (Mr. ROGERS). I am reassured that our colleague is contemplating hearings "to examine," as he put it in the Digest article, "ways of safeguarding the public while permitting delivery of

more effective and safe drugs to fight disease."

It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Dripps, who devoted his life to medical science and gave so much of himself in the recent past to the selfless cause of obtaining for Americans "the medicines we need—but do not have," died suddenly at age 61 on October 30 of heart disease. I cannot help but wonder whether his life might have been saved by a drug that was not there in his hour of need. It is my hope that others on the Dripps committee will carry on this good work.

I include the Reader's Digest article by Walter Ross at this point in the RECORD:

THE MEDICINES WE NEED—BUT CAN'T HAVE

(NOTE.—Over the past ten years, a medical crisis has developed that affects the lives and health of all Americans. The crisis stems from the lack in this country of new prescription medications—medications widely used abroad—to treat our most threatening diseases. It involves delays of many years in the introduction of new medical discoveries, as well as a recent sharp decline in the discovery and testing of new and needed drugs.

(What follows is the first detailed report in a national magazine describing this mounting emergency, which a number of medical authorities refer to as the "drug lag.")

(By Walter Ross)

A 33-year-old American woman who had suffered crippling allergic asthma attacks for 15 years found nearly total relief recently through a British prescription medicine called cromolyn sodium. Although available in Britain (where it is the third most widely prescribed remedy) since 1969, and under study in the United States since 1966, the medicine could not be legally prescribed for this patient by her doctor. Since only this medicine helped the woman, her doctor (like many other U.S. doctors) broke the law by asking friends who traveled abroad to smuggle back a supply. This benevolent, but illegal, traffic stopped only in late June 1973, when the U.S. Food and Drug Administration finally approved cromolyn sodium. We were the 55th country in the world to do so.

At least seven new medications for asthma have been introduced in Europe since 1962. Some are effective in some patients, others in other patients. By mid-1973, only two—now including cromolyn sodium—could be prescribed in this country.

For people suffering from high blood pressure and the painful heart ailment called angina, a new kind of drug has come into use in recent years. Known as a "beta-blocker," it blocks the damaging effects on the heart of adrenaline and a related substance, lowering blood pressure and relieving angina. An elderly Rochester, N.Y., woman was recently treated successfully in Great Britain with a beta-blocker called practolol. She could not get it here. The only beta-blocker available in America—propranolol—made her ill.

This is only one example of the lack of new heart drugs in this country. From 1967 through 1971, ten medications to treat irregular heartbeat (arrhythmia) came on the market in Europe; by mid-1973, only one had made it safely to our shores. In all, we have only about six of the 47 new heart and circulatory remedies that were introduced abroad between 1967 and 1971.

A powerful drug (guanoxan) which reduces blood pressure—but also causes liver dysfunction in a great many patients—has been in use in England since 1964. Many British doctors feel the medication is worth the risk of liver problems in patients who do not respond to other treatment, because

these side effects can be reversed, whereas the effects of high blood pressure (hypertension) are not reversible and can be catastrophic. In the United States, tests of this drug had to be suspended when the FDA warned the manufacturer that it was too dangerous.

Although hypertension affects an estimated 23 million Americans, we have not had a single new general-purpose anti-hypertension medicine in this country since 1963. From 1967 through 1971, five such drugs came into European medical practice.

Sounding the Alarm. A great many American doctors are unaware of the drug lag. However, in 1972, 22 leading medical experts—headed by anesthesiologist Dr. Robert D. Dripps and including such renowned specialists as heart surgeon Michael DeBakey, cardiologist Irvine H. Page and pharmacologist Louis Lasagna—compared notes and became alarmed at the extent of the crisis. In a petition to Congressman Paul G. Rogers (D., Fla.), they complained: "The procedures by which new drugs are evaluated and approved for use in this country are causing us to fall behind in this important area of medical science. The system perpetuates a continuing decline in the number of new drugs entering the market and may be depriving the practicing physician of agents beneficial to patient care."

Examples of the drug lag that so provoked the doctors abound. Consider just a few:

A study conducted by Dr. William M. Wardell, a professor at the University of Rochester, of the 82 new medicines adopted in both Britain and the United States between 1962 and 1971 found that more than half were introduced first in Britain—an average of 2.8 years before the FDA permitted them to be sold here. Dr. Wardell also turned up nearly 80 medications approved for prescription in Great Britain during that time, not one of which had made it into the United States, including several drugs that British physicians rate better than anything currently available here.

In 1968, doctors in Italy began using a powerful new antibiotic, called rifampin, to treat patients with tuberculosis. It was not until 1971—after 50 other countries had adopted the drug—that rifampin became available in the United States. It is impossible to estimate what the delay meant for the 119,000 American TB victims under treatment during this time, or for the 17,000 who died of TB. But, according to many papers presented before the American Lung Association, the drug has been proved effective in patients whose TB is resistant to other antibiotics.

An especially promising, very long-acting injectable form of tranquilizer (fluphenazine decanoate) was developed by an American company several years ago to treat schizophrenia, a mental illness which fills half the beds in U.S. mental hospitals. Introduced in England in 1969 it "revolutionized the community care of schizophrenia," according to Dr. W. Linford Rees, professor of psychiatry at the University of London. A study showed that only five percent of patients treated with this drug relapsed as opposed to 45 percent treated by other methods. It was not made available to U.S. schizophrenics until 1973.

Collective Chill. Modern drugs—90 percent of them discovered between 1935 and 1965—have revolutionized the practice of medicine, and added at least ten years to the average life expectancy in developed countries, according to Sir Derrick Dunlop, former chairman of the British Ministry of Health's Committee on the Safety of Drugs. But even as science began unleashing these therapeutic wonders, the potential for harm mounted. In 1937, a U.S. pharmaceutical company decided to put sulfanilamide, a new and useful weapon against strep and other infectious organisms, into syrup form. To

manufacture what became known as "Elixir of Sulfanilamide," a solvent, ethylene glycol, was used without prior tests for toxicity. Ethylene glycol was a poison, and the Elixir killed nearly 100 people.

As a result of this outrage, Congress passed a law in 1938 demanding proof of safety—a giant step forward in drug regulation—before manufacturers could market new medicines.

The next major change in U.S. drug laws did not come until 1962, after the infamous thalidomide incident. During the late 1950s, this new sedative was considered so free of side effects that it was sold in Germany without prescription. But when an American company submitted a New Drug Application (NDA) for thalidomide, a medical officer at the FDA, Dr. Frances Kelsey, noted German reports of nerve inflammation in people who had taken thalidomide for a long time. Dr. Kelsey says she wondered what might happen to the fetus of a pregnant mother taking thalidomide. Since there were no answers available, she held up the application.

Birth defects began showing up among the children of European women who had taken thalidomide (the drug was also available by prescription in England), but it was several years before the defects were connected with the medication. Eventually, over 5000 deformed babies were traced to thalidomide in Germany; nearly 400 in England. In this country, although the drug was widely distributed for testing, only 18 such cases have been found by the FDA.

Dr. Kelsey was hailed as a heroine who had singlehandedly prevented a drug disaster in the United States. Nevertheless, the closeness of tragedy sent a collective chill down American spines. With rare unanimity, Congress passed a tough new law requiring—for the first time anywhere—that a new drug be proved both safe and effective before it is licensed.

Bureaucratic Tree. Sounds wonderful. But the fact is that no medicine can be proved safe for people by testing it in animals. And there is no way of knowing whether or not a medicine will cure a human disease without giving it to a human being. So, in order to enforce an absolute demand with relative means, the FDA took the seedling of the '62 law and cultivated it into a mighty bureaucratic tree that sprouts regulations and paperwork in all seasons. In 1948, for example, Parke, Davis & Co. was able to get a license for its Benlyn Expectorant with a mere 73 pages of facts. In 1968, the same company's application for the anesthetic Ketalar required a truck to haul its 72,200 pages, bound into 167 volumes, to the FDA.

To achieve the mountain of fact on Ketalar, the company had to test it for almost seven years: first in animals; then in healthy people; finally in sick patients—and then wait another two years after the application was filed, before having it approved. Today, an NDA takes an average of 27.5 months to pass through the FDA. Before 1962, it took about six-months. (To clear Ketalar in Britain required only 857 pages and some four months.)

There are three main differences between our system of drug clearance and those of the other countries which demand proof of safety and efficacy. We are later in starting clinical testing of new drugs, for regulatory and industrial reasons. We demand longer periods of investigation—often years longer—and in thousands more patients. These time differences, together with our 27.5-month clearance time, account for the lag between the introduction of new drugs overseas and in the United States. They add several million dollars to the cost of each new drug—a cost passed on to consumers.

Experts conclude that under today's regulations a number of our most important current medications would never have made it

even to the human testing stage, much less to the marketplace. It seems hardly likely that aspirin could pass muster under present rules, since under certain circumstances it causes birth defects in rats and other animals. And if penicillin were being tested today it would not pass its animal trials—with consecutive injections during a few days every guinea pig and hamster in which it is injected dies—and thus penicillin probably could not be tested in people. Says Dr. Wardell: "If even one drug of penicillin's stature has been unjustifiably banished to a company's back shelf, that event will have harmed more people than all the toxicity that has occurred in the history of modern drug development."

Another result of the drug lag is the sharp decline in the discovery and testing of new and needed drugs. In the ten years before the 1962 regulations, the U.S. pharmaceutical industry produced and marketed an average of 43 new medicines a year. Between 1962 and 1970, this figure dropped to 17. In the last five years, the average has fallen to 13. And even while they produce fewer marketable drugs, American drug manufacturers have been spending more and more money on research and development—up from \$212 million in 1960 to \$728 million last year. Before 1962, a drug could be tested and marketed in about two years, at a cost of \$1 to \$2 million. Today the process takes an average of seven years, and may cost as much as \$11 million.

The Choice to Be Made. These are the dimensions of our expanding drug-clearance problem. What is the solution?

For a crisis as many-faceted as this, there is no clear, simple answer. Several large medicine manufacturers refuse to speak on the record, for fear of FDA reprisals. But one industry leader, Dr. Gerald D. Laubach, president of Pfizer, Inc., has said, "To increase the flow of new medications, we should shift some of the FDA's emphasis to surveillance of new drugs in the first years after approval. This would better protect the public, and would give people the benefits of research progress as it occurs."

Says Dr. Lasagna, "You need only a small amount of good clinical work to establish that a drug is effective and reasonably safe. It takes a lot of work, however, to pinpoint safety and efficacy with precision. It seems wasteful to spend years getting more data just so that people can have a spurious sense of confidence."

The FDA told me that "there are no examples of truly important new drugs being delayed in this country solely because of over-regulation or bureaucratic red tape." But individual FDA people apparently disagree. Dr. Henry Simmons, former head of the agency's Bureau of Drugs, said not long ago, "We can keep adding more and more requirements, which are justified scientifically, but we may reach the time when the goose just has no more golden eggs."

C. Joseph Stetler, president of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, is certain that "the American regulatory maze tends to hinder needed new medications from reaching patients; defenders of the system tend to understate lost patient benefits and overstate the 'safety' achieved through delay." His solutions are administrative: abbreviated NDAs, effective use of advisory panels, upgrading of Bureau of Drugs personnel, hopefully to bring new drug approvals "within the approximate time required in other medically sophisticated countries."

Opinions also vary widely on Capitol Hill. Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D., Wis.) thinks that present laws are inadequate "to protect the American people against poorly tested, unsafe, ineffective, improperly used, monopolistically priced drugs"; he has introduced an 83-page bill to strengthen government regulation. On the other hand, Rep. Paul G. Rog-

ers (D., Fla.), who heads a subcommittee charged with overseeing the FDA, says, "During the past year we have received numerous complaints about new drugs failing to reach the marketplace. We believe that hearings probably will have to be held to examine ways of safeguarding the public while permitting delivery of more effective and safe drugs to fight disease."

Sir Derrick Dunlop told me, "It is doubtful whether rigid laws can suitably be applied to the licensing of medicines, since each one represents an individual problem to be treated by common sense." Americans have long been noted for common sense. Isn't it time we applied this trait in the area of medicines—and admitted that in seeking to be "totally safe" from drugs we have in fact weakened our defenses against disease?

THE CASE FOR THE SAFE SCHOOLS ACT—III

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the homecoming parade this year at Los Angeles City's Jefferson High School ended with a shootout in which five students including the homecoming princess, were wounded. In addition, Los Angeles officials confiscated guns from 40 students during 1 recent month. Between September and December of 1972 the Los Angeles County high school system reported 83 cases of weapons possession. The Los Angeles Unified School District reported 299 cases of weapons possession during the same period. In November, 1972 a Los Angeles high school student was shot and killed while on the school grounds.

In January 1973, an 18-year-old was studying quietly in his high school's study hall in St. Louis when an intruder demanded that he give up his new black leather coat. When the youth hesitated, he was shot to death.

In Fort Lauderdale, a teacher died last year as a result of a gunshot wound inflicted by a former student.

There were 16 shooting incidents in Kansas City schools between September 1972 and April 1973. Everett Copeland, security manager for the Kansas City schools has said:

Kids carry guns for different reasons. Some say they have been threatened, some involve extortion attempts. Some kids just say it's a status symbol.

Last February, Terry Aryan of the Associated Press described the surge of students carrying and using guns in and around public schools in the following article:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 4, 1973]
MORE AND MORE STUDENTS TAKING GUNS INTO THE NATION'S CLASSROOMS
(By Terry Aryan)

Public school officials in cities across the country report a surge in cases of students carrying and using guns in classrooms, corridors and school yards during the last year.

Most incidents occur at inner-city high schools. The weapons are usually cheap, small-caliber handguns, the so-called "Saturday night specials." Officials relate the

increase to the revival of juvenile gangs in some cities and the persistence of racial tension.

An Associated Press survey indicated the scope of the problem:

There have been 60 gun episodes in Los Angeles schools since September. Shots from a passing car killed a 16-year-old student near Locke High School. The car sped into the school parking lot and three students were later arrested.

Fifteen handguns were confiscated last year in Atlanta schools. A 12-year-old boy, angered when schoolmates chided him for disobeying a traffic signal, got a pistol from home and opened fire on the school playground. He hit no one.

Four high school students, three of them girls, were expelled last month in San Francisco for carrying guns.

School officials in Topeka, Kan., took a gun from a girl who said she needed it for protection.

There were 15 school gun cases in Detroit and four in Seattle during the last year. Since September, 15 incidents have been reported in New York and 15 in Kansas City.

"We have a problem and it is increasing," said Everett Copeland, security manager for Kansas City schools. "Kids carry guns for different reasons. Some say they have been threatened. Some involve extortion attempts. Some kids just say it's a status symbol."

The problem has escalated so rapidly that national statistics are lacking. A few schools now keep records on gun incidents, but comparative figures from past years do not exist. The International Assn. of School Security Directors last year began pushing for uniform reporting procedures that would include such figures.

"There is no question about the increase," said James Kelly, who directs school security seminars for the International Assn. of Chiefs of Police. "There are thousands of cheap guns on the streets. The kids pick them up with ease. These kids have definitely moved out of the zip-gun stage."

School administrators and security officers have responded to the problem in several ways.

Officials in Atlanta are convinced the only real solution is to persuade students they do not need guns. "We try to sell the idea that one does not need to come to school armed," said Asst. Supt. Ed Cook Jr.

Many school districts have doubled or tripled the size of their guard forces. At some Los Angeles schools, only one entrance is opened and a security officer is stationed there. Guards at some New York schools make occasional "pat-down" searches to see if pupils are carrying weapons.

The rash of gun episodes has sharpened the debate over whether school guards should be armed. Officials in Baltimore recently vetoed the request of guards that they be allowed to carry guns. In New York, school guards do not carry guns but in Chicago three-quarters of the schools now have armed guards.

School officials agreed the situation they face reflects the bigger problem of guns in society.

You have kids who see guns at home, who see people carrying guns all the time, and those kids are going to carry guns too, said Van Turner, deputy administrator for school safety in New York.

Security guards in Baltimore recently took a loaded rifle from a girl's locker, but such incidents are rare. Most of the guns seen in schools are short-barreled 22 caliber pistols that cost \$10 to \$20, the "Saturday night specials" police have said play a major role in big-city violence. Importation of such weapons was restricted by the 1968 Gun Control Act, but attempts to regulate domestic production failed last year in Congress.

Racial incidents have triggered gunfire at many schools.

A scuffle broke out in November between

blacks and whites in a corridor at Pontiac Central High School in Pontiac, Mich. Five pupils—four of them white—were wounded in a burst of pistol shots. A 16-year-old black youth later surrendered to police.

In New York, Chicago and Los Angeles, officials said juvenile gang feuds led to several school shootouts.

Last fall's homecoming parade at Jefferson High School in Los Angeles ended in a barrage of gunfire that wounded five pupils. The shooting erupted after three cars loaded with members of a gang, the Acey Deuceys, arrived at the school. Two of those wounded belonged to a rival gang, the Crips. Police said the other victims were bystanders.

How did the shooting affect other pupils? "Students that are never in any hassles are saying they are going to start carrying guns," said Jefferson's student body president, Keith Kertindall. "You don't know who to trust."

The following article reprinted from the April 26, 1973, issue of the Los Angeles Times gives more evidence of the growing incidence of serious violent crime occurring in the Los Angeles public schools.

FOUR YOUTHS ARRESTED IN SCHOOL SHOOTING OF 15-YEAR-OLD GIRL (By William Hazlett)

Juvenile gang activity, a continuing campus problem, was blamed Wednesday for the shooting of a 15-year-old girl on the lawn at Dominguez High School in Compton.

Police said the victim, Robin Sessam, was wounded in the neck by a bullet fired from a passing car. She was reported in satisfactory condition after emergency treatment at Dominguez Valley Hospital.

Det. Kay Barger said four youths were arrested in connection with the shooting that occurred about 1:55 p.m. Tuesday on the campus at 15302 San Jose Ave.

The suspects, Richard Dean Triplett, 18, whose address along with the victim's was withheld in fear of retaliation, and his three juvenile companions were booked on suspicion of assault with intent to commit murder, the detective said.

Police said a .25-caliber automatic is believed to have fired the shot.

TEACHER HURT IN ASSAULT

In another school incident, a 14-year old student at Henry Clay Junior High, 12226 S. Western Ave., was arrested and turned over to juvenile authorities after an assault on a substitute teacher.

Sheriff's Capt. Ken Hays said the diminutive youngster was taken into custody about 11 a.m. Wednesday after he reportedly attacked Hugh Bruce Epton, 26, with his fists.

Four classmates pulled the boy off the teacher, who suffered numerous cuts and bruises, Hays said.

School authorities said the two incidents are typical of a growing number of assaults and violent attacks on both students and faculty at city and county schools.

In the fiscal period from July 1, 1972, through Feb. 28, 1973, the latest compilation available, Los Angeles city schools reported 95 student assaults on teachers and 183 student attacks on other students.

Reported, but not recorded, were two recent incidents at Henry Clay Junior High involving an attack by a parent on a teacher which resulted in the teacher suffering a broken jaw, and an attack by a parent on the registrar.

In Los Angeles County, preliminary figures for the first three months of 1973 indicate a slight decrease in violent incidents, according to Supt. of Schools Richard M. Clowes.

"Of course, this is an interim report and we can't say it represents any solid trend at this point," Clowes cautioned.

"Part of the decline might be related to a tightening of the guidelines or reporting procedures."

The widespread appearance and use of guns and incidents of serious crime in our Nation's public schools is staggering.

On November 1, Albert Shanker, president of the United Federation of Teachers, said that "local school districts have failed to provide minimum protection for staff and students under their jurisdiction." He also said that security has become a bigger issue in his union than salaries and classroom size.

Shanker said:

A safe environment must be provided in every school if teaching and learning are to take place and if the physical well-being of pupils and school personnel are to be protected.

The Safe Schools Act—H.R. 2650—which I introduced in January, would provide the public schools of this country with the assistance that they need in establishing effective security systems.

DISCOVER AMERICA TRAVEL ORGANIZATION

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, the following statement was submitted by William D. Toohey, president of Discover America Travel Organizations, to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in connection with the National Emergency Petroleum Act. I think Mr. Toohey's statement represents

a good assessment of how the energy crisis will affect the travel industry, and I submit it to the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM D. TOOHEY

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: Discover America Travel Organizations, Inc., (DATO) is the national organization of the travel industry. DATO's membership is drawn from about 600 individual organizations, firms, and other agencies concerned with the development and promotion of tourism within the United States and by foreign residents to our nation.

Included in our membership are 62 state governments and territorial travel promotion and development offices, 45 transportation associations and individual companies, 49 firms and associations dealing with the lodging and food service industry, 100 regional, metropolitan and local travel promotion organizations, over 100 travel attractions and sightseeing firms, together with about 250 other firms and organizations cooperating in travel development and in information about and in the promotion of tourism.

Our purpose in this statement is to establish in definitive terms the scope and importance of tourism in America's economy and to suggest ways that the jobs of millions of Americans who are dependent on tourism can be protected without impairing efforts to reduce energy consumption. Frankly, we are concerned that employment related to tourism may be overlooked in legislative deliberations. We note, for example, that the ban on Sunday gasoline sales will affect businesses serving tourists almost exclusively.

S. 2598, as passed by the Senate, refers to the need for restrictions against the use of fuel or energy for "nonessential uses such as . . . recreational activities." These examples suggest that tourism and recreation are perceived by some to be of relatively little consequence in our economy. We will submit data that will serve to correct that impression. In addition, we will provide perspective on patterns of fuel consumption that, we believe, will indicate clearly that opportunities for significant reductions in motor fuel

consumption lie not in cutting back tourist travel, but in more efficient utilization of automobiles for local travel in the home environs.

WHAT IS TOURISM?

In this discussion, a tourist is defined as one who travels fifty miles or more one way, by any form of transport, from one's home environs for any purpose whether for business, health, recreation, or any other personal reason except commuting to and from work. This is the definition used by the National Tourism Resources Review Commission in its 500,000—world report, "Destination U.S.A.", which was submitted to the President and Congress on July 25 of this year. The Tourism Commission, we are aware, emanated from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as a result of an amendment to the International Travel Act of 1961 approved October 21, 1970 (Public Law 91-477, 91st Congress, H.R. 14685). The economic data in the report establishes authoritatively the total scope of tourism in the United States and evaluates its economic impact. The report establishes the fact that tourism in the United States is a huge enterprise providing the livelihood for millions of people. It is a vital part of our American life style. A Bureau of Census study indicated that someone in nearly two out of three households in the United States took at least one trip during 1972.

\$61 BILLION ENTERPRISE—4 MILLION JOBS

Two tables summarize the Commission's analysis:

Table 1 shows estimated tourist expenditures in the United States, including that of foreign visitors, in 1960/61, 1970 and 1980 by expenditure item and tourist category. In current dollars tourism expenditures are estimated to have grown from \$23 billion in 1960/61 to \$50 billion in 1970, an increase of 116 percent. In 1980, expenditures were projected by the Commission to reach a level of \$127 billion, an increase of 155 percent over 1970. The 1980 projection does not reflect an energy shortage in the 1970's; the dimensions of today's crisis could not have been anticipated when the estimates were made.

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED TOURISM EXPENDITURES AND PERCENTAGE GROWTH IN EXPENDITURES BY EXPENDITURE ITEM AND TOURIST CATEGORY, 1960-61, 1970, 1980

(In millions of current and constant 1970 dollars)

Expenditure item:	Constant (1970) dollars			Current dollars			Percent increase			
							Constant (1970) dollars		Current dollars	
	1960-61	1970	1980	1960-61	1970	1980	1960-70	1970-80	1960-70	1970-80
Food.....	4,854	7,536	14,708	3,331	7,536	21,851	55	95	126	190
Lodging.....	5,381	8,635	17,777	3,602	8,635	27,119	60	106	140	214
Public transportation.....	4,039	7,469	15,302	3,161	7,469	19,800	85	105	136	165
Recreation.....	731	1,271	2,835	506	1,271	4,216	74	123	151	232
Other incidentals.....	3,440	5,269	10,097	2,428	5,269	13,386	53	92	117	154
Owned vacation home.....	398	718	1,524	268	718	2,308	80	112	168	221
Gas, oil, tolls.....	3,009	4,535	7,099	2,577	4,535	8,371	51	57	76	85
Other auto operating expenditures.....	3,922	6,691	11,366	2,887	6,691	15,117	71	70	132	126
Auto purchase cost.....	4,623	7,604	13,362	4,219	7,604	14,716	64	76	80	94
Total.....	30,397	49,729	94,068	22,980	49,729	126,884	64	89	116	155
Tourist category:										
Households.....	18,463	31,266	61,905	14,162	31,266	83,302	69	98	121	166
Businesses.....	10,674	16,301	27,231	7,946	16,301	36,375	53	67	105	123
Foreign visitors.....	1,261	2,162	4,933	873	2,162	7,208	71	128	148	233
Total.....	30,397	49,729	94,068	22,980	49,729	126,884	64	89	116	155

Source: National Tourism Resources Review Commission.

EMPLOYMENT ATTRIBUTABLE TO TOURISM¹ IN THE U.S.A., 1970

(Industry employment in thousands)

All Industries.....	3,456
Directly employed.....	2,341
Food service.....	620
Lodging.....	771
Public transportation.....	331
Recreation.....	76
Other incidentals.....	160
Owned vacation homes.....	6
Automobile operations ²	395

Indirectly employed.....	1,115
Agriculture, forestry and fishing.....	45
Mining.....	45
Construction.....	17
Food and tobacco.....	70
Textile mill, apparel and fabricated textile products.....	157
Paper and allied products.....	24
Printing, publishing and allied industries.....	28
Chemicals and allied products.....	43
Petroleum refining and related industries.....	22
Rubber and plastic products.....	48
Leather and leather products.....	24
Lumber and food products.....	7
Furniture and fixtures.....	1
Stone, clay and glass products.....	11
Primary metal industries.....	19
Fabricated metal products.....	21
Machinery.....	41
Transportation equipment.....	19
Motor vehicles.....	10

Miscellaneous manufacturing	18
Transportation	96
Communications	27
Electric, gas and sanitary services...	16
Trade	82
Finance, insurance and real estate...	49
Other services	175

¹ Does not include automobile purchases, but only spending on current account by tourists and the supplying industries.

² Does not include auto purchase cost.

SOURCE.—Report of National Tourism Resources Review Commission.

The main point is that tourism in total is big business, although it is, in fact, comprised of a large variety of small and large establishments. The Commission stated that, "... of all retail activities, tourism would be second only to grocery sales if it could be classified as a single retail activity".

Table 2 shows the employment generated directly and indirectly by such expenditures in 1970—a total of 3.5 million jobs, of which 2.3 million serve the tourist directly and 1.1 million are in industries supplying the tourist industry. Many of the personnel serving tourists are low-skilled and marginally re-employable which makes them particularly vulnerable to disruptions in the economy. It is important to realize that significant segments of such apparently unrelated industries as agriculture, mining and textiles are also dependent on a viable tourism industry.

It is important to note here that the United States economy has changed radically since World War II from work force oriented to goods production to one oriented to providing services. One of the largest service industries in the United States today is tourism.

Applying the methodology of the Commission, it is estimated that tourism expenditures in 1972 were about \$61 billion and involved just under 4 million jobs. Furthermore, tourism contributes to the economy by the earning of foreign exchange as a result of the expenditures of foreign visitors. This is significant to our international Balance of Payments position.

A second important and highly authoritative study, by the United States Travel Data Center, the nonprofit, independent, national travel research organization, revealed that weekend travel of 100 miles or more away from home generated nearly \$11 billion in expenditures in 1972. The study was confined to that portion of the tourism industry involved in travel of 100 miles or more which is compatible with the 1972 Bureau of Census Transportation Study.

Tourism, that is, travel more than 50 miles from home, as defined by the National Tourism Review Commission Report, involves every mode of transportation—car, bus, plane and rail. However, a key point made by the Tourism Commission is that 86.1 percent of all trips away from home were made by automobile. Trips by bus, rail and air are vital to tourism and their needs must be accommodated, but the real potential for fuel savings is centered around passenger cars.

FUEL AND JOBS

Table 3 shows estimates of motor fuel consumption in the United States in 1972 by type of use. It will be seen that all motor vehicles consumed 105 billion gallons of fuel of which 73.5 billion gallons were consumed by cars.

However, trips by cars over fifty miles, that is, those made by tourists, consumed only 17.5 billion gallons. This represents 16.6 percent of total consumption and only 23.8 percent of total passenger consumption.

From this data three points emerge:

The 17.5 billion gallons of fuel consumed on trips over fifty miles have a direct causal relationship with the 4 million jobs created by tourism. Cuts in fuel availability for such

trips would have an adverse effect on many of these jobs.

Potential for reductions in fuel consumption is more than three times greater when passenger cars are used for local travel, including commuting to and from work under fifty miles, than when use is for trips over fifty miles for tourism.

Reductions in fuel consumption that are realized from car pools, greater use of mass transit, and other conservation measures, should have minimal adverse effect on jobs in local industries and businesses.

MOTOR FUEL¹ CONSUMED IN THE U.S.A.
BY USE, 1972, VEHICLE TYPE, GALLONS
CONSUMED

	Millions of gallons
All motor vehicles.....	105,062
Trucks and combinations.....	30,718
Passenger vehicles.....	74,344
Buses ²	881
Cars ^{3,4}	73,463
To and from work trips.....	23,044
Other trips under 50 miles.....	32,959
Trips over 50 miles.....	17,460

¹ Includes gasoline and all other fuels under state fuel laws. Excludes exports and federal military purchases.

² Includes school buses.

³ Includes taxicabs and motorcycles.

⁴ Consumption allocated on basis of Department of Transportation's Nationwide Personal Transportation Survey, 1970; unpublished tabulation ratios of mileage for business or personal use to total mileage; ratios of mileage on 50.0-99.9 and on 100.0 miles or more trips to total miles traveled.

SOURCE: U.S. Federal Highway Administration; Highway Statistics; Nationwide Personal Transportation Survey, 1970.

We feel these points are relevant to a proposed imperative to the Administration. Section 208 of Senate Bill 2589, the National Emergency Act of 1973, states, "In carrying out his responsibilities under this Act, the President shall take into consideration and shall minimize, to the fullest extent practicable, any adverse impact of actions taken pursuant to this Act upon employment. All agencies of government shall cooperate fully under their existing statutory authority to minimize any such adverse impact."

APPROACHES TO THE PROBLEM

The issue at hand, as we see it, is how to attain the overall objective of reduced fuel consumption without causing serious disruption of the economy. We recognize that tourism must be disrupted by a fuel shortage; it already has been. Three approaches to solving the fuel shortage problem are discussed below.

1. *Voluntary conservation.* The present policy of the Administration to solicit voluntary cooperation of the public in reducing fuel consumption combined with restrictions on highway speed in conjunction with allocations of fuel to specific priority industries will, we hope, work. We believe that to attain maximum effectiveness, a massive educational program and greater use of modern techniques will be needed to modify the public's attitude toward car-pooling and greater use of mass transit systems. Such an effort should result in efficient utilization of fuels in urban areas. In rural areas, where tourism may be a major economic factor, other measures may be needed. We propose that consideration be given to allocation of fuels on a priority basis to service stations on or adjacent to interstate highways. Not only trucks and busses, but also the longer distance traveler in passenger cars, could depend on an adequate supply of fuel. Many of those businesses serving travelers away from home could survive the present crisis under this plan, since our interstate network is so extensive that the traveler would likely be near his destination when he returned to

non-interstate highways. A reduced allocation of fuel to stations in population centers to effect a higher allocation of fuel to the interstate system could be expected to stimulate compliance with car-pool and mass transit programs.

2. *Fuel Tax.* In our judgment, a higher tax on fuels would not represent a serious constraint to most of those who would desire to drive fifty or more miles outside his home environs. The Tourism Commission showed a direct correlation between tourism and income; most of the traveling public could afford to pay the tax. In this limited sense, therefore, we could support the fuel tax approach. However, we recognize that such a tax would be a burden on people with low income who must drive for subsistence, and that means of relief would be cumbersome or delayed, or both. For this reason, we do not encourage a fuel tax approach if another satisfactory approach could be employed to attain overall objectives.

3. *Fuel Rationing.* A straightforward rationing program without allowance for long distance travel requirements could, we feel, have serious effects on the economy and jeopardize 4 million jobs associated with tourism. We must assume that gas rations would be consumed by local driving and that out-of-town driving would be drastically reduced. Out-of-town travel is essential if the economic contribution of the tourism industry is to be maintained. We suggest, therefore, that a mechanism be built into any rationing program that would permit equitable treatment for long distance travel. We propose specific consideration of a plan whereby rationing and a gas tax be combined. Local travel requirements would be controlled by rationing. In addition, gasoline carrying high tax would be available to satisfy long distance travel needs or desires. A program with these elements could be designed within overall fuel reduction objectives, yet many jobs in tourist-serving industries would survive during the emergency period.

In our consideration of the present situation, we have tried to be sensitive to the realities with which Congress and the Administration must deal. By giving due regard to travel outside the home city, an industry comprised of 4 million people can be protected. Conversely, by concentrating efforts to have fuel on local travel, not only is the gas shortage alleviated but environmental goals might be achieved simultaneously. Car pools make sense. Mass transit makes sense. Design and implementation of programs to facilitate a change in habits is a challenge to our best minds, but certainly not beyond their capability. Estimates produced by others with special knowledge of mass transit system and car pool potentials indicate that a target of two billion barrels per day reduced consumption can be substantially achieved by better utilization of passenger cars.

The energy emergency is forcing difficult decisions not only for the Administration and Congress, but also for the general public. To date, we would observe that voluntary public response to the Administration's requests for cooperation has been impressive. Many specific measures to restrict fuel consumption have become operative, ranging from lower speed limits to more frequent engine tune-ups to attention to proper tire inflation. Unfortunately, none of these measures appear to be sufficient. In the future, it may be necessary, for example, to question such matters as the relative priority of air pollution devices on automobiles versus savings of fuel through elimination or modification of such devices. Certainly such alternatives as rationing and gas taxes are difficult to accept in peacetime.

Today we have emphasized the economic benefits derived from long distance travel. We do not advocate any single approach to the energy emergency. We only submit our urgent plea that the important nature of

tourism be recognized and that the employees who serve tourists not be forgotten in whatever approach is adopted.

Thank you for receiving this statement. We are prepared to answer any questions or submit additional information with respect to tourism to the Committee.

SOUND ACTION BY SEC ON CORPORATE TAX INFORMATION

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the Securities and Exchange Commission is to be commended for its recent action in requiring corporations to disclose the source of significant Federal tax write-offs as well as the reasons for paying less than the effective corporate income tax of 48 percent.

Last month, I submitted comments to the SEC hearing record in support of their proposed regulation. I am pleased that they have completed this action which will be of great assistance to investors and to the Congress as it deals with corporate tax legislation.

I enter in the RECORD at this point a brief article on the SEC action which appeared in the Washington Post of November 28, 1973:

NEW SEC RULE REQUIRES MORE TAX DISCLOSURE (By Jack Egan)

Corporations in future financial statements filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission will have to publicly disclose the source of significant federal tax writeoffs as well as the reasons for paying less than the effective corporate income tax rate on their earnings.

The purpose of the expanded tax disclosure requirements announced yesterday is to permit investors "to distinguish more easily between one-time and continuing tax advantages enjoyed by a company and to appraise the significance of changing effective tax rates," the SEC said.

The SEC approved the new rules over the strong objections of corporations. In comments when the rules were proposed, the companies claimed the information would be valuable to business competitors but of little use to individual investors.

They also said the disclosures could lead taxing authorities to question deductions and also would breach the confidentiality of their Internal Revenue Service returns.

The SEC said the objections did not outweigh the public interest in requiring more detailed tax disclosure.

Among the items companies will have to report under the new rules are the tax effect of plant and equipment depreciation, research and development expenses, warranty costs and other liabilities which are deferred over several years.

Corporations also have to explain or "reconcile" the difference between the income tax they paid and the amount computed by multiplying pre-tax income by the "applicable statutory federal income tax rate." This would reveal the source and nature of major deductions.

The SEC said it recognized that the information would be used primarily by professional analysts who are trying to understand the precise reasons for corporate results and not by individual investors.

But SEC commissioner A. A. Sommer Jr.

noted in remarks to United Press International that "most investors rely on the advice of expert analysis," and also would benefit.

CAUCUS PREROGATIVES ENDANGERED BY BUDGET CONTROL BILL SECTION

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the new budget control bill scheduled for action early next week. But Members of the House should be aware of the fact that one provision of that bill which relates to the membership on the Budget committee trespasses to a dangerous degree upon the prerogatives of both the Republican and Democratic caucuses in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I support fully the provision in H.R. 7130 which provides for the specific designation of Appropriations and Ways and Means membership on the new Budget committee and I will lead an effort in my own caucus to insure that the provisions in that bill become part of our caucus rules. But I feel strongly that that action should be taken only in each of the respective party caucuses and not on the floor itself.

The gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) will offer an amendment when the bill is under floor consideration to strike that portion of the bill.

I intend to support that amendment and I hope a majority of members of both parties will do likewise. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a letter sent to members of the Democratic caucus by seven members of the Appropriations and Ways and Means Committees who agreed with the provisions of H.R. 7130 which relate to Budget Committee membership, but suggest a different procedure by which that same membership may be brought about.

The letter itself refers to a resolution by Representative BURTON of California which he had intended to offer in the Democratic caucus. The amendment will be offered on the floor, however, by Mr. MATSUNAGA of Hawaii. The arguments remain the same for both and I would hope that in the interest of preserving the independence of both caucuses it would be adopted.

I insert the text of the letter below:

IMMEDIATE ATTENTION

DEAR COLLEAGUE: In the Democratic Caucus tomorrow morning a number of questions will evidently be raised about the new Budget Control bill (H.R. 7130). One of the provisions of that bill requires that members of Appropriations and Ways & Means be assigned to the proposed new standing committee on the Budget.

We agree with the purpose of that provision. Our service as members of the two committees involved has convinced us that it is essential that Appropriations and Ways & Means be represented in the new Budget Committee if that committee is to function effectively on budget and tax policy questions. But, we strongly believe that such representation should be achieved in the traditional manner through the party

caucuses and not through legislative action in the House as a whole. That, as you know, has been the practice in all matters relating to the make-up of committees since 1911.

Therefore, we urge your support for the resolution which Representative BURTON will offer at tomorrow's caucus reaffirming caucus prerogatives in this area while establishing a caucus policy that Appropriations and Ways & Means members be represented on the Budget Committee.

We believe it would be a dangerous mistake to override caucus prerogatives in matters relating to committee memberships. Republicans have no business participating in the selection process by which Democratic members are assigned to committee, and similarly, Democrats have no business mixing in the selection process by which Republicans are assigned to committees.

During the debate on the Legislative Reorganization Act in 1970, some 30 members of both parties including many opponents of the seniority system opposed a floor amendment specifying that committee selection need not be on the basis of seniority on the grounds that that matter was clearly a caucus prerogative. Similarly, in 1971 many of Chairman McMillan's severest critics supported him on a floor vote challenging his chairmanship again on grounds that a dangerous precedent would be set if the House over-rode caucus prerogatives in this area.

We believe it is essential to maintain these important principles.

Enclosed is a list of members who spoke in opposition to the seniority amendments in 1970 and some of the floor statements made by members and party leaders in opposition to the McMillan effort.

We strongly urge your support of the BURTON amendment which will preserve caucus prerogatives in the committee selection process while still guaranteeing representation for Ways & Means and Appropriations members on the new Budget Committee proposed in H.R. 7130.

Sincerely,

DAVE OBEY.
ROBERT GIAIMO.
SAM GIBBONS.
FRANK EVANS.
SIDNEY YATES.
HUGH CAREY.
WILLIAM GREEN.

MEMBERS WHO SPOKE IN OPPOSITION TO SENIORITY AMENDMENTS TO THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1970, JULY 28, 1970

DEMOCRATS

Albert, Bennett, Bingham, Boggs, Bolling, Celler, Dent, Dingell, Eckhardt, Fraser, Hansen, Hays, McCormack, Moss, Obey, Pucinski, Sisk, Vanik, Waldie.

REPUBLICANS

Collier, Conable, Erlenborn, Gubser, Harsha, Martin, Saylor, Smith of California, Steiger of Arizona, Steiger of Wisconsin, Wyatt.

FLOOR STATEMENTS OF MEMBERS OPPOSED TO EFFORT TO DEPOSE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHAIRMAN McMILLAN BY HOUSE ACTION, FEBRUARY 4, 1971

Majority Leader Boggs: "We would be establishing a precedent here that could be carried to any length . . . If the Majority Party voted unanimously, we could displace any committee member or every committee member nominated by the minority."

"And if a minority on the Democratic side and a majority on the Republican side get together they could take over control of the entire committee system in the House."

Minority Leader Ford: "The Democratic Caucus made a decision. Whether we on our side agree with or not, by precedent that is

a matter within the ranks and prerogatives of the Majority Party."

"We should not get into the procedures and prerogatives of the majority party . . . The Democrats should (not) make decisions for use (and) we should not become involved in making decisions for the Democratic Party."

Mrs. Green of Oregon: "This kind of suggestion has the greatest potential for mischief of anything in terms of two-party procedure that we can develop. Its long-term significance transcends the specific selection of any single chairman. The procedural policies in organizing the House must be maintained or there is going to be absolute chaos. Party responsibility will be destroyed and no one will know who to hold responsible as far as the two parties are concerned for successes or failures. Let us look at the long-range implications of such a departure as is proposed."

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan: "I happened to be on the losing side (on the McMillan vote in caucus), and I am unhappy with the result, but that does not make any difference with respect to the basic premise stated by the majority leader and the minority leader that each party should be free to make its own decisions without hindrance from the other."

Mr. Burton of California: "It is a most dangerous precedent . . . to in effect give the minority caucus veto power over the majority caucus deliberations. It would establish a precedent that could seriously and adversely affect the way the business of the House of Representatives is run."

Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania: "It has been the custom that each party shall select its own people and set the seniority and that they shall select the membership of the various committees and their own officers and that the other party would do the same."

"Unless this comity is kept, unless this courtesy continues to exist between the parties . . . I believe it would do a great disservice and damage to the two-party system."

MISS SIBYL POOL

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, we in Alabama lost one of our distinguished citizens last month with the death of Miss Sibyl Pool of Linden.

Sibyl Pool spent the major portion of her adult life in service to the people of Alabama through the political offices to which she was elected. She was the second woman in the State's history to win a seat in the legislature when she represented Marengo County in 1946. Eight years after entering the Alabama House of Representatives, she became the first of her sex to win statewide office when she was elected secretary of state. She served in that capacity for 6 years, followed by 4 years as State treasurer. At the time of her retirement because of ill health in 1971, she had served as a member of the Alabama Public Service Commission for 16 years.

Miss Pool's career in public life spanned 34 years, longer in political office than any other woman in the State's history. Sibyl Pool devoted the major portion of her life to service to others and her passing is a great loss to those who knew her. She will be truly missed.

SOLAR ENERGY: ANSWERS FOR TODAY AND POTENTIALS FOR TOMORROW—PART IV

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the administration's energy pronouncements in recent months have clearly been a disappointment. Perhaps the most disappointing aspect of the President's program is its lack of commitment to energy research and development. The President has stated the need for this research, but he has not given us a program or provided the necessary revenues. In short, he is hiding behind his own rhetoric.

The establishment of an energy research and development trust fund is the only responsible alternative for providing the revenues necessary for a massive Federal effort in this area. I have suggested such an approach in H.R. 6194, the Energy Development and Supply Act of 1973. This trust fund will provide the vehicle for a thorough exploration of new, clean, dependable sources of energy.

Solar energy falls into this category of energy resource. Although the President has expanded the budget for solar research in recent years, it still is insignificant relative to its potential impact on our future economy. A recent article which appeared in the Cleveland Press outlines this tremendous potential. The author, Mr. David Dietz, states the remarkable fact that the solar energy falling on the surface of Lake Erie in an average day is more than the total energy used each day in the entire United States. The problem for research is to develop ways of converting this energy efficiently so that we can use it. For the interest of my colleagues, I am including the complete text of this article in the RECORD: SUNLIGHT HITTING LAKE ERIE COULD OPERATE THE NATION

(By David Dietz)

The energy contained in the sunlight falling on Lake Erie on an average day is more than the total energy being used that day in the entire United States.

Bringing the figure closer to home the energy in the sunlight falling on one acre of ground is about 4000 horsepower. That on each square yard of your front lawn is 1.5 horsepower.

That is why scientists believe that an accelerated program is needed to speed up the utilization of solar energy. They are unable to understand why President Nixon impounded \$60 million which Congress voted for research on solar energy, geothermal energy and the gasification of coal.

A report being assembled by the Atomic Energy Commission, due in December, is expected to recommend a five-year \$10 billion program of research in all fields of energy including, of course, atomic energy.

It would be a big mistake to think that all the solar energy reaching the earth goes to waste. If the sun suddenly went out, the earth would be plunged into total darkness.

The temperature would quickly begin to fall. Within a week the tropics would be as cold as the North Pole. Soon the oceans would freeze to their lowest depths. Finally the atmosphere itself would freeze.

About a third of the sun's energy reach-

ing the earth evaporates water from the oceans, lakes and rivers. The water vapor forms clouds and eventually returns to the earth as rain or snow.

Green plants grow by a process known as photosynthesis which utilizes the energy of sunlight. Since animals eat plant or each other, life would be impossible without solar energy.

But trees and plants use only about 1% of the solar energy that falls on the ground. The other 99% is reflected back into the atmosphere.

Some of that, the scientists say, must be put to work to meet the problem of giving mankind more energy while the storehouse of natural resources is being depleted.

A FOURTH ENERGY MESSAGE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has heard another Presidential energy message. An editorial in the November 27 issue of the Minneapolis Tribune points out that the administration appears to be moving with events, rather than directing their course.

The President's major energy message to Congress last April failed to propose steps to require equitable allocation of scarce supplies. It failed to set up a system of standby reserves for emergencies. It failed to make a long overdue commitment of funds needed to develop alternate sources of energy for the future. And it failed, most notably, to move to curb consumption.

Only after outbreak of war in the Middle East, when indications of mounting shortages and potential economic disruption could no longer be ignored, did the administration move to require allocation of propane and heating oil, although Congress had authorized this action 6 months earlier.

Now, after Congress has passed additional legislation requiring it, crude oil and gasoline will be included in the program.

In his latest energy message, the President has proposed several sensible conservation measures. But even these will not result in sufficient savings.

A 17-percent, nationwide shortage seems inevitable, with regional shortages running much higher. What the President has recommended—if it works—will save us only 10 percent. Where is the rest to come from?

As the November 27 Minneapolis Tribune editorial indicates, unpopular steps are called for. With its popularity at an alltime low, the administration apparently lacks the courage to impose strong measures such as rationing or excess-use taxes.

The editorial follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune,

Nov. 27, 1973]

A FOURTH ENERGY MESSAGE

In his fourth energy message of the year—and his second in less than a month—President Nixon added little new to what he has previously said about the nation's fuel shortages or proposed in the way of solu-

tions. Several of the proposals he announced Sunday night were either already in the works or had been anticipated. For example, several states had already put into effect a 50-mile-an-hour speed limit, and at least 30 percent—and perhaps 40 percent—of the country's gas stations already were closed on Sundays. Cutbacks in jet fuel and the allocation of heating oils were already under way.

Two weeks ago Congress gave Mr. Nixon authority to deal with some aspects of the fuel problem, and further measures with new grants of authority are expected to be passed soon. But the leadership must come from the White House, and Mr. Nixon still gives the appearance of backing into solutions rather than facing up to the over-all problem.

On the immediate problem of gasoline shortages, for example, Mr. Nixon continues to draw back from such consumption-reducing measures as rationing or sharp tax increases on the grounds that they would be unpopular. Unpopular, they might be. But strong measures are, in the minds of most of the country's energy experts, unavoidable, too, and the sooner the administration takes strong steps to reduce consumption the better. Every day that passes, the shortage of gasoline—along with other fuels—becomes more apparent. On Nov. 7, the administration estimated that the country would be short 10 percent of gasoline. On Sunday, administration officials said the estimate now is 21.4 percent. What will the estimate be in another 18 days?

Administration critics have labeled each of Mr. Nixon's previous energy messages as "too little, too late." They are saying—with equal justification—the same about the message he broadcast on Sunday. There is plenty of evidence indicating that as long as three years ago and more, the administration and the oil industry were aware of trouble ahead, but neither of them, it seems, was prepared to take the necessary steps to curb consumption. To take one instance alone, the Vietnam War: Americans who watched the vast quantities of oil poured into Indochina as recently as a year ago might be excused from wondering why they can't get enough to heat their homes this winter.

Short-term cutbacks undoubtedly will get most Americans through this winter without too much distress. There still is an enormous amount of energy available in the United States. But a policy based on short-term actions will provide only short-term relief. The energy crunch that is upon us all is not just a temporary emergency. It more likely is, as Stewart Udall pointed out in an article on this page in Monday's Tribune, "a deepening long-term impasse that is certain to escalate and send shock waves through our economy for at least a decade."

In this sense, it is not only misleading but dishonest for the president to hold out the hope that if his plans are followed the country can become energy self-sufficient by 1980. This goes completely against the grain of comment from the nations most knowledgeable energy experts. "Patently absurd," was the way a Shell Oil Co. official put it in Minneapolis recently. Mr. Nixon would serve himself and the country better if he stopped pretending that there are easy, painless solutions that by the end of the decade will bring the nation to the point where, in the president's words, "we will once again have those plentiful supplies of inexpensive energy which helped to build the greatest industrial nation and one of the highest standards of living in the world."

The hard reality, says Udall, "is that the era of abundant, cheap oil has ended—and there have never been any short-cut substitutes in sight for this versatile commodity." That's the sort of plain talk the country should be getting from the White House.

RESOLUTIONS ON THE SUBJECT OF IMPEACHMENT

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the Reform Democratic Association of Great Neck recently passed a number of resolutions on the subject of impeachment. I would like to include these resolutions in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTIONS

The Reform Democratic Association of Great Neck does hereby urge the House of Representatives to vote the impeachment of President Richard M. Nixon for the following reasons:

THE WAR IN INDOCHINA

For at least 14 months prior to the invasion of Cambodia by United States armed forces in May 1970, President Nixon authorized a secret air war against Cambodia while denying that such an offensive was in effect. The May 1970 land invasion was undertaken by President Nixon without Congressional approval. These illegal actions caused thousands of Cambodian and American deaths, destroyed Cambodia's neutrality, and flouted the United States Constitution, the Charter of the United Nations and the basic principles of international law.

SUBVERSION OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS

On July 23, 1970, President Nixon approved an interdepartmental intelligence project (supposedly abrogated five days later) sanctioning an unprecedented campaign of political espionage and sabotage against any opponent of administration policy. Evidence has been presented at hearings of the Senate Select (Ervin) Committee indicating that the project has never been cancelled and in fact is in operation to this day. This project violates not only the Bill of Rights but recent Supreme Court decisions that electronic surveillance is illegal.

In 1971, President Nixon authorized the establishment in the White House of a special investigative unit known as the Plumbers to engage—for political purposes—in a program of breaking and entering, infiltration and provocation, forgery, and acts of violence to persons and property. This unit was illegal in that it was immune from supervision by the several security organizations created by the authority of Congress.

TAMPERING WITH DUE PROCESS AND THE JUDICIARY

President Nixon set in motion procedures leading to the burglary of the office of Dr. Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist, in violation of the laws of California and of the United States. This burglary has resulted in the indictment of one of the President's chief assistants. President Nixon sought also during the Ellsberg-Russo trial to influence the outcome of the trial by offering to the trial judge the directorship of the FBI.

President Nixon and his chief aides sought to cover up the Watergate crimes and the government's criminal activity in the Ellsberg case by asserting CIA involvement and national security concerns. For five weeks President Nixon deliberately withheld from the trial judge in the Ellsberg case the evidence of the burglary—until the Attorney General of the United States and his deputy insisted that it be revealed.

THE ASSAULT ON FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

President Nixon has throughout his terms of office demonstrated contempt for the First Amendment guarantees for the media. Some examples: The Justice Department's sub-

poenas for journalists to force them to divulge their sources of information; the federal government's attempt to enforce for the first time in the nation's history the doctrine of "prior restraint" in the publication of news (the Pentagon Papers Case); the wiretapping of Washington correspondents, and fraudulent investigations to intimidate diligent reporters (the case of Daniel Schorr of CBS-TV news).

TAMPERING WITH THE ELECTORAL PROCESS

President Nixon, as the Senate hearings and court actions have revealed, was either fully aware of or criminally negligent about the violations of federal law in the collection and illegal use of campaign funds to ensure his reelection. Federal criminal indictments have been returned against his immediate subordinates at Cabinet level. There is uncontested evidence of heavily financed undercover interference with the electoral efforts of President Nixon's opponents through fraud, espionage, libel, slander, burglary, wire-tapping, extortion, favors to selected industrialists, false reporting, bribery and perjury.

UNAUTHORIZED IMPOUNDMENT OF FUNDS

President Nixon has refused to spend over \$40 billion in congressionally approved and appropriated funds for health care, housing for the needy, assistance for the children of working mothers, and for handicapped persons.

The degree to which the President has impounded funds in defiance of the authority of Congress is unprecedented in our history.

VIOLATION OF THE RIGHT OF PRIVACY

President Nixon recently taped his conversations with numerous persons conferring with him in his White House office. This is a gross breach of confidence more appropriate for the head of a police state than for the elected head of a democracy. President Nixon has compounded this breach by refusing to make these tapes available to the special prosecutor in the Watergate investigation, whose appointment he approved, and to the Senate Select Committee.

IMPROPRIETIES IN THE ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY

President Nixon has issued contradictory and incomplete explanations about the manner in which he has acquired valuable property in California and Florida, with the questionable assistance of wealthy friends. There are also unanswered questions about the expenditure of at least \$10 million in Federal funds for alterations at the Nixon homes at Key Biscayne and San Clemente, allegedly for reasons of security.

LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 26, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, this month, 55 years after the declaration of independence by an optimistic Latvian nation, we are reminded of what a travesty freedom can become.

Around the world it is only the Latvian descendants in other countries and Latvian emigres who are free to commemorate that happy day in 1918; those citizens still in Latvia are facing more of the degradation they have endured for the past 33 years under Soviet domination.

Despite the subjugation of ethnic culture, heritage, and pride in Latvia, despite forced resettlement and tyrannical treatment, the desire for freedom and

self-determination has not been eliminated.

In the climate of détente, the United States and other free nations have an opportunity to press even more strongly for restoration of human rights and human dignity in the captive nations.

As we move cautiously toward a more peaceful world, we must remember that peace and stability must be accorded all peoples of all nations. We must stand as firm as the courageous Latvian people and reassert the basic principles of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, which both the United States and the Soviet Union have signed. We must continue to work for the day of true freedom for all men.

HON. GERALD R. FORD'S ADDRESS
BEFORE THE UNITED JEWISH AP-
PEAL'S DINNER FOR LIFE

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased and honored to attend the United Jewish Appeal Dinner for Life at the Colonie Hill Restaurant with GERALD R. FORD, our distinguished minority leader and Vice-President-designate.

I submit to the RECORD his fine address which was received with warmth and enthusiasm by all:

ADDRESS ON ISRAEL

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a special pleasure to address you at a time when the world seems finally ready, after so many tragic years of bloodshed and senseless procrastination, to acknowledge an unavoidable reality.

That reality is the reality of Israel's existence. The United States has worked long and hard—and often alone—to uphold Israel's security. In the peace negotiations that are at long last about to begin between Israel and the Arabs, we will continue to support Israel's existence and her right to live in security.

The relationship between the United States and Israel has always been a unique one, and as I worked on these remarks I tried to come to some conclusions about why this should be so. I think I've come up with at least a partial answer, an answer involving the Bible, a poet, a statue, and the work the UJA is doing to assist Russian emigrants. The plight of Soviet Jewry, incidentally, is one that has long concerned me, and I'm sure some of you here tonight remember that I addressed this subject at a rally for Soviet Jewry in Madison Square Garden in 1971.

The passage in the Bible to which I referred comes from Isaiah. I'd like to read a few brief excerpts. According to the prophet, the mission of Israel was, and I quote, "... to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free ... to deal thy bread to the hungry and ... bring the poor that are cast out to thy house ... Then shall this light break forth as the morning ..."

As you are well aware, the historical parallels between our age and the age of Isaiah are striking. Then, as now, for example, the Jewish people were returning to Zion to rebuild their nation.

But there is another contemporary historic parallel that I find even more striking.

Listen to the following lines, ladies and gentlemen. I am sure you know them by heart.

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,

The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, the tempest-tossed to me:

I lift up my lamp beside the golden door.

Those are, of course, the famous lines engraved on the pedestal of the greatest symbol of human freedom in the world—the Statue of Liberty. They are also the closing lines of a poem that celebrates America as the haven for the world's oppressed. The poem is entitled "The New Colossus." The author was Emma Lazarus, a Jewish woman who organized relief for Jewish refugees who had fled the oppression of 19th century Russia.

The ring of Isaiah is in those lines. I think those words on the Statue of Liberty capture the essential spirit of both America and Israel—almost uniquely among the nations of the world—havens for the persecuted, the homeless, the oppressed.

And it is because of this unique common tradition, I believe, that the bonds between America and Israel are so very close. There is no contradiction whatsoever between the support you offer to Israel and the loyalty you feel toward America.

There are many of you in this audience tonight whose parents came to these shores fleeing oppression. Some of you came under those conditions yourselves. And as you all know, the accomplishments of the UJA in assisting such immigrants have been nothing short of phenomenal. And what you and your parents found here was something you could not find in the nations you left—the promise that you could rise just as high and travel just as far as your abilities and dedication could carry you.

All of you here tonight have realized that promise, and your lives are tangible testimonials to a very simple but often overlooked truth—the American system is alive and healthy. The system does work. You have proved that it works.

Still another truth about our society is that it is diverse, a pluralistic society strengthened socially and culturally by the beliefs and customs of the various nationalities and religions that found sanctuary and opportunity here.

The melting pot theory still holds. The melting process, of course, distills different social and philosophic views down into common national goals and purposes. That melting process should not, however, attempt to boil out those unique things we bring to America as members of distinct cultural groups, qualities which help to enrich our society as a whole.

Too often, I believe, we stress the sameness, the homogeneity of American life while ignoring the healthy differences and variations that give such richness to the American fabric.

The texture of our Nation, which has contributed to its unparalleled greatness, comes from many ethnic, religious and nationality strains. America, as we know it and love it, is like a good soup. Its full flavor comes from the blending of many ingredients.

Yet from many quarters we hear a great deal of talk about assimilation—especially from the younger generation. And, of course, it is necessary that we should be alike in some ways—in our standard of justice, our concept of democratic government, our common ideal of liberty and freedom.

But, we must also recognize that we can pay too high a price for sameness. We can make our soup bland. There are differences that we cannot afford to lose.

I do not like to believe and do not concede that in this country we have Italian-Ameri-

cans, Irish-Americans, Afro-Americans or Jewish-Americans because the hyphen implies that different groups should be treated differently. This is wrong.

On the other hand, it is necessary to understand that different groups have added immeasurably to American life because they are different. Out of their differences have grown ideas, a fuller cultural life, and a more interesting and stimulating America. Our national outlook is broader; our character stiffer.

Rather than question in any way those who feel deep emotional ties to other countries—whether it be Israel or Ireland or Italy or Africa—we should salute this as a manifestation of the genius of our Nation. This is part of what we call Americanism. It is one of the things that make both Israel and America unique in the world. The beauty of Joseph's coat was that it was of many colors.

It is perfectly impossible for Americans to hold on proudly to the best elements of their different national heritages—and yet be united in common love for our country. And let me add here that no single group of Americans has been more steadfast in standing up for our country than our Jewish citizens.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, let me mention one more basic American quality, perhaps the finest of all—the willingness to sacrifice to help your fellow man.

It's an old concept, one of the finest embodied in the Judeo-Christian tradition, the concept of charity. And perhaps no group in America has more distinguished itself for its generosity and its philanthropy than the American Jewish community. The Greek root of the term "philanthropy" means love of mankind. And I know of no people who better personify this love than those who give to the United Jewish Appeal.

You can take profound pride in your record. Since 1938, UJA funds have saved over 3 million lives and have helped make possible the transformation of Israel into a dynamic and progressive land.

As you all know, the recent fighting in the Middle East took a tragic toll. In fact, given population ratios, the number of Israelis who died each day during the recent fighting was equivalent to approximately 7,000 American deaths per day. Thus your efforts to help Israel "bind up the wounds of war" seem especially appropriate at this moment in history.

At the same time, other needs also press in Israel. For example, immigration to Israel continues and spending on immigration alone was over \$1 billion before the hostilities broke out.

This is a time of testing, and the road ahead will not be an easy one. But for the first time in decades, the road does seem passable with some of the roadblocks removed. This Administration has spent five years in attempting to clear away international obstructions to peace by building bridges to those nations with whom we once had no dialogue.

And the indications are that now such bridge building may be possible between Tel Aviv, Cairo, and Damascus. Perhaps finally the way may be clear. Richard Tucker has given us an inspirational rendition of the Israeli national anthem here tonight, and it is the closing lines of that anthem that we find the hope of the future expressed so clearly:

"The hope of two thousand years, To be a free people in our land, In the land of Zion ..."

Ladies and gentlemen, I believe we will make that hope a reality.

And so I salute you—salute you for your support of a worthwhile cause—and salute you, my fellow Americans, because you have unselfishly helped pave the road to self-reliance for the people of Israel. With pride

you can say you have played a major role in Israel's progress. With your head high, you know you have personally shared in an enterprise of historic significance for the survival of the Jewish people and of the spirit of human freedom and dignity to which it is dedicated. Shalom.

HON. RICHARD LUGAR, MAYOR OF INDIANAPOLIS, SPEAKS OUT ON ENERGY CRISIS

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on November 20, 1973, Mayor Richard G. Lugar, of Indianapolis, addressed the city over television on the energy crisis, what it means, and what Indianapolis can do about it.

His speech, plus an editorial from the November 22, 1973, Indianapolis Star complimenting him on it, follow:

ENERGY EQUALS JOBS

(An address by Richard G. Lugar, mayor, city of Indianapolis, Nov. 20, 1973)

The economy of the United States and the technologically advanced nations is based on energy. Energy is the ultimate raw material which permits the continued recycling of resources into most of our requirements for food, clothing, and shelter. The productivity (and consumption) of society is directly related to the per capita energy available.

Today, human labor provides for far less than one per cent of the work performed in factories, refineries, and mills in the production of products. Literally, our economy and our way of life could not continue without vast amounts of energy. With the exception of the Soviet Union, none of the industrialized nations of the world is self-supporting in energy. They, together with most developing nations, will continue to compete vigorously with the United States for available supplies. A transition from a buyer's to seller's market in energy, worldwide, seems a likely prospect for ensuing decades.

The essential facts of our current energy problem are these: The United States depends upon petroleum to meet 46% of its energy demand. Petroleum is used at a rate of approximately 17 million barrels a day in the United States. Imports accounted for 33% of all U.S. crude oil and petroleum products prior to the recent Mideast curtailment. Recent curtailments will mean a shortage during this winter of at least 2 million barrels per day of crude oil and petroleum products. If the Mideast oil cutoff continues, the shortage will be approximately 3 million barrels per day or 17% of normal demand.

Heating oil shortage will be approximately 15% of expected demand. Gasoline shortages will be approximately 7%, and this percentage could increase if refineries can obtain higher production of heating oil at the expense of gasoline in the refinement of crude oil.

Most of us know that demand for energy has been rising rapidly. Many of us are displeased that current international developments have left this country so vulnerable. In days to come, substantial criticism will be levied at oil companies who have not expanded refineries in this country in step with demand for petroleum products and have serviced the needs of other countries allegedly at the expense of this country. The oil companies will point to environmental restrictions on refinery building plus local hostility, smothering governmental controls on pricing which made investments less profitable and governmental protectionism which discouraged oil imports until too late.

Various citizen groups who have fostered stringent air quality standards have rejoiced in the delay or cancellation of oil refinery construction, the delay of nuclear power plants, the termination of much coal mining, and difficulties posed for automobiles. Perhaps even more of us have consumed energy without much conscious thought about conserving either energy or money. Energy has been abundant and relatively inexpensive, and we have centered our attention on other issues such as international peace or the strengthening of life in urban and rural areas of America with confidence that we had adequate capacity of energy to move forward.

For the moment, we must recognize that international peace is at the forefront of consideration in this energy crisis.

The Arab nations have observed, accurately, that we are a people who demand a lot of energy and seem determined to enhance present life-styles and demand more energy in the future. The Arab nations have made the same observation in regard to Western Europe and Japan.

Make no mistake about the fact that we are the intended victim of international blackmail of the greatest historical importance to our country. The Arab Nations believe that we will be hurt sufficiently in the coming months that we will meet their terms in the Middle East for the settlement they demand. Following that, they believe that we will stand by as American property is confiscated and that we will pay almost any price demanded for petroleum products they control. Several European countries have caved in quickly to meet Arab demands and abandoned even a token display of NATO solidarity with the United States. Given the nature of this crisis and the demands of citizens in each Western democracy, the United States has watched its friends literally disappear over the hill. In truth, only 11% of our imported oil comes from the Arab countries, but the policies of our allies have jeopardized attempts to import make-up quantities from any other source. Even our greatest source of petroleum imports, the Canadians, have upped the price to us by a substantial sum and curtailed our potential supplies, in addition.

Ironically, you may remember that some United States senators who fought and delayed the Alaskan Pipeline legislation for years argued for a pipeline across Canada and naively pointed to the safety and economy of this route for the Midwest.

The only safe course for the future of this country is self-sufficiency in production of the energy which we will need. The Arab nations have been effective in their strategic policy because they could count upon the desperation of citizens in countries who use oil to demand that oil shipments continue lest normal economic and social life grind to a halt.

Our predicament is serious but it is not desperate. If we use common sense and calmly face the facts, we will establish that this country cannot be blackmailed. We are strong enough to maintain peace and stability in a world which will become a great deal more jittery in the coming months.

I will leave to others further analysis and moralizing over why we are using so much energy and who should have provided more planning, production, less control, and all the rest. Our task, now, is to assess quickly the extent of the problem in Indianapolis and to detail the steps we must take to provide a strong economy, and a minimum of physical suffering for all citizens during the winter months ahead.

First of all, the good news of our situation should be noted. The Indianapolis Power & Light Company has the capacity to provide ample electric power to this community for the foreseeable future. Electric power is not in short supply. For good reasons, we will

need to conserve all energy including electricity but we need to note as accurately as possible the truth of our current predicament. We have no need to express alarm about electric power.

Other areas of the country will not be so fortunate for reasons evident in our own history of electric power consumption in Indianapolis. The use of electric power has grown in startling leaps.

For example, the average residential use of electricity in Indianapolis was 2,478 kilowatt hours in 1952 and 4,525 in 1962. That average rose to 7,729 kilowatt hours in 1972, an increase of well over 200% in 20 years with an average price in 1972 of 2.232 cents per kilowatt hour as compared to 2.563 cents twenty years ago.

Because electric power is available in ample supply and is less expensive than 20 years ago, it is difficult for some to imagine how and why problems might develop. But let us remember that it was difficult for some to imagine how natural gas might come into short supply just two or three years ago. But energy users make substitutions. Businesses and individuals cut off from some sources of energy will seek alternatives in better supply. To be specific, former oil and gas users are switching to electricity. Furthermore, the use of electric power has been on a growth pattern of 7% compounded annually for a long time in this country. Finally, our own supply of electric power this winter is primarily dependent upon the Indianapolis Power & Light Company being allowed to burn Indiana coal.

Small and large industrial and commercial enterprises in Indianapolis used 69.7% of electric power consumption in 1972 as opposed to 28.8% use by 255,228 residential customers. Substantial electric power savings will be most easily obtained in large industrial usage. Our future economic growth is dependent on these farsighted conservation measures, now.

For individual homeowners, it is very important to adopt and to maintain a conservation spirit which means turning off the lights and appliances which no one is using and using appliances that are economical to begin with as opposed to being careless and wasteful.

Symbolic of our community concern, the Christmas tree on Monument Circle will use less than 50% of the electric power it used last year. The spotlights on the tree will be turned off. The Indianapolis Power & Light Company's own building on the Circle will remain dark. There is no need to panic and to rush into many ill-advised reductions, but the time is at hand for changes in life-style and for the conservation of electric power by some reasonable percentage that will not cause immediate discomfort but will insure greater capacity for the continued health and safety of Indianapolis. Energy shortages will last for several years. We will enjoy abundant electric power during that time if we begin to conserve now.

Natural gas poses a different set of problems. Families living in homes heated by natural gas will have adequate supplies this winter. The same can be said for schools and for large volume industrial users. Those who do not have natural gas service or who have interruptible supply arrangements will be without natural gas during most of this winter.

Approximately 61% of Indianapolis homes are heated by natural gas and the adequate heating supplies for these families are a source of considerable reassurance to the community. Likewise, 59% of all public school buildings in Indianapolis and Marion County are heated by natural gas and should have ample fuel supplies for building heat.

The natural gas picture has been one of limited supply for many months in Indianapolis. The supply picture will not change during the months ahead. Generally speak-

ing, if you are enjoying the service now, you will probably continue to enjoy it for the foreseeable future. Otherwise, you will be seeking other sources of heat and energy. Some of the pressure from the termination of natural gas supplies has fallen on the fuel oil alternative thus increasing demand for that inadequate supply. Other demand has moved toward electric heat which will accelerate pressures on that front.

No new gas supplies are on the way. The conservation of natural gas is an obvious goal for the community. Our ability to be prudent in usage is a small price to pay for the certainty that most of the homes of this community will continue to be warm and that most factories will continue to operate. Unlike the electric power picture, the bulk of gas revenues come to Citizens Gas & Coke from residential users and the bulk of the economies must come from 149,244 gas heating customers.

In viewing the petroleum products scene, we find a grave situation. Many units of city government and school government have already received notices from large suppliers of fuel oil indicating that only 96% and in some cases, 88% of last year's purchases will be available during the coming year.

The 29% of Indianapolis homeowners who use fuel oil for heat will have a variety of outlooks. Our office has polled twenty large and medium sized fuel oil distributors and found that homeowners who have a stable customer-supplier relationship on a keep-full basis are in relative safety of receiving an adequate supply of fuel oil this winter. Those homeowners who do not have a stable relationship and those who usually buy small quantities of fuel oil at various times will be the most likely to run into difficulty and to need to file for special allocations through the government of the State of Indiana.

For Indianapolis, the immediate energy crisis boils down to a severe shortage of fuel oil. To the extent that more petroleum is shifted at the refinery into fuel oil as opposed to gasoline, gasoline supplies will dwindle faster and shortages will become critical sooner rather than later.

Shifts and substitutions within a fixed, short supply of energy will continue for years. This is the reason that no supply is safe and that all energy must be conserved.

President Nixon has asked for immediate national consideration of the most practical means of conserving fuel oil and gasoline immediately. Failure to effect savings in amounts of 10% or 20% will mean rationing by means of price, special taxes, coupon books or all three in a last ditch attempt to prevent the halt of basic industries, basic governmental services, and suffering by millions of Americans.

The fundamental fact remains that we do have 80% of the petroleum which we will need this winter and possibly more depending upon how cold the winter is and how long current international curtailments last.

As a nation, we can effect the 10% to 20% savings and preserve prosperity and health to say nothing of the independence of our foreign policy if we are able to see the problem now and to act.

Obviously, if many citizens do not see any problem, they will not help in the solution. Equally unfortunate are some citizens who see the problem but are too busy settling old scores by suggesting that they will do nothing until others do something.

I do not intend to purport a course of action designed to cause inconvenience or to effect a social or economic policy change under the guise of conserving energy. I will propose constructive action which will lead to common sense strengthening of our economy and safety.

First of all, because our major immediate problem is adequate energy for heating, we can best meet this head on by lowering

thermostats in every building in Indianapolis. For most people, this should mean an average reading of 68 degrees. This goal is absolutely critical in any building warmed by fuel oil or we shall very likely run out of supplies and a degree of unemployment and suffering is inevitable this winter and for a long time to come.

Savings in natural gas, electric heat, and steam heat are also important because all should be conserved. All are likely to be in shorter supply and to increase in price as will fuel oil. If the normal citizen cannot turn down the thermostat to help save the job and health of another citizen, perhaps he will do so at least to save his own money, substantial money before the year is over.

Secondly, we must save gasoline, the other major petroleum product now in short supply and destined to become critically short without major conservation now. As in the case of fuel oil, each citizen is not being asked to abstain from total use but simply to save a little fuel. This can be done by driving at 50 m.p.h. or less on highways, by better maintenance of car engines, by eliminating needless idling of engines, and by not using the car in circumstances when a car pool, use of public transportation, bicycling, or walking will prove just as satisfying and much less expensive.

I make these suggestions on fuel oil and gasoline with full knowledge that enforcement of total compliance is impossible. Hope for voluntary compliance is only as strong as one's faith in individual conscience and sense of self discipline.

The Indianapolis Police Department and the Marion County Sheriff now ticket hundreds of speeding drivers each week who even under severe penalty of law cannot control excessive speed and a shocking waste of energy. The law is important but it can never be as strong as the motivation which comes from individual concern about loved ones, about neighborhood and community, and about the future of our country.

Energy equals jobs. Waste or energy will be unemployment for someone else. I have no doubt that a business as usual attitude will lead to severe hardship including loss of income for thousands of Indianapolis citizens. That will mean, ultimately, loss of income for most of us. I am equally certain that we have a good chance of preserving basic city services, keeping schools open, and maintaining strong employment if we use less fuel oil and gasoline now, and if we develop conservation habits to save natural gas and electric power.

The government of the city of Indianapolis will take a leadership role in energy conservation.

Except for circumstances when health would be endangered, all buildings will be heated at 68 degrees with lower thermostat settings in buildings infrequently used by the public or city employees. We intend to set a pattern of saving all fuels because we will need to continue on such a course for at least three to five years through the ups and downs of various supply situations.

Except for emergency conditions, all Indianapolis owned cars will travel at less than 50 m.p.h. We will emphasize and offer incentives to car pools and the use of public transportation.

Substantial gasoline savings have been realized by the City during 1973 with a 7.6% reduction in the number of gallons of gasoline purchased as compared to a comparable period of 1972. During 1974, we shall achieve a further 15% reduction in gasoline purchase amounting to over 500,000 gallons. 990 vehicles of the 1320 cars owned by city and county governments are used in public safety. A new system of internal control will be instituted to achieve these gasoline savings by the Department of Public Safety.

With the assistance of the Indianapolis

Center for Advanced Research, the Department of Public Works will re-engineer the combustion processes of the waste sludge incinerator to achieve a 20% saving in fuel oil consumed at the Sanitation Plant. The automobile gasoline saving plan and combustion re-engineering projects should result in a saving of 17% of all petroleum product usage by the City government in 1974.

Also in cooperation with the Department of Public Works, the Indianapolis Center for Advanced Research will be employed to assist in applying a biological respirometer to control secondary treatment units and effect a 13% saving of all of the electric power now used by City governmental operations.

These savings in petroleum products and electricity will achieve an approximate 13% saving of all energy by the City of Indianapolis government to which will be added the other departmental programs and economies of individual employees.

City government has taken a thorough inventory of energy consumption and found that the most substantial savings are possible in Sanitation Plant operations because 45.8% of current energy consumption occurs in these locations.

Ironically, the fuel oil allocation to the City government is too low, at present, to continue operation of the sludge incinerator at full capacity after January 1, 1974. If we cannot operate the incinerator and must lagoon the sludge, the first casualty of the local energy crisis will occur soon at the Sanitation Plant. We will seek additional fuel oil or other suitable fuel to maintain the progress our city has enjoyed in emptying the lagoons and creating substantial environmental progress in solid and liquid waste disposal, but the fuel allocation is not present to insure sludge incineration for the near future.

Several major industries of our city have pledged to do as much as City government to effect significant energy conservation now. As a common sense matter, industrial and business conservation is good business in terms of lowering costs and enhancing the best possibilities for continued profitable operation of plants.

Business and government must approach each conservation measure with considerable prudence if we are to remain employed and healthy. For example, a case has been made by the trucking industry and by local Teamsters that speeds higher than 50 m.p.h. will be needed by trucks which deliver goods in a timely manner and provide necessary warehousing for much of the production line material which keeps our plants open and operating each day. While we are trying to save energy, and thus save jobs, we must not create unemployment inadvertently by adopting measures which disrupt jobs and production. As I read the daily mail coming into my office, I am fearful that some citizens are proposing specific energy conservation for some other citizens that might create hardship for all of us and not much saving of energy. At the same time, we must publish sound information on energy saving actions which are effective and easily adopted by each family.

I am deeply impressed with the leadership of young citizens in carrying forward conservation methods learned in our schools to homes and community centers. Their action has been timely and inspiring.

My office will be in constant communication with school, labor, and business leaders to obtain their advice and counsel on how best to save energy and to increase general welfare with the least inconvenience. I have been pledged the full cooperation of leaders in all sectors of public and economic life of this city. I pledge the full support of our leadership to Governor Bowen and President Nixon as they co-ordinate state and national programs.

If we are able to show measurable savings as a community, we are going to make a good case against passing out the coupon books and installing the bureaucracy of fuel oil or gasoline rationing.

I am alarmed that 40 members of the United States Senate on November 15 attempted to mandate that President Nixon start rationing on January 15. Their amendment was defeated by only 48-40.

In any society, some citizens seem to take delight in trying to control the lives of others, and some folks while arguing patriotism and national emergency are seemingly eager to start the rationing process.

If the people in Indianapolis and for that matter in the rest of this country want to delude themselves into believing that we have no shortage of petroleum, and as a result, continue to use it up with no visible conservation, we will have severe shortages and then emergencies and will then have only the choices of rationing or running off the cliff with reckless abandon.

At present, our choice is much more noble and much more sensible. We can prove voluntarily that this country can move quickly and decisively to counter international economic blackmail and to overcome an abundance of past mistakes in planning forecasts and appropriate governmental action or inaction. We can indicate that Americans are not fattened by abundance to such an extent that we lack the toughness to discipline our own appetites for energy and to set up better conservation practices to meet future contingencies.

The energy conservation program of this winter is not the last time that we will need to act with concern for scarce resources in this country and this world. As we have witnessed widespread famine in Africa this year and the dwindling of world wide food supplies, we know that even greater perils than a crisis of energy face many countries. We are the last breadbasket of the world, uniquely self-sufficient in food supplies. Our food production is now our major strength in foreign policy and trade.

The focus on energy will lead to a stronger United States because we will adopt President Nixon's goal of energy independence and make appropriate substitutions during this decade which will enhance air and water quality. Coal, nuclear energy, hydrogen will all receive our attention, and we will achieve break throughs in years to come that can make this country self-sufficient.

For the moment, however, the long-range objectives will not warm any homes nor will indiscriminate condemnation of oil companies, environmentalists, our enemies, our allies, or wishful thinking about the weather help one bit.

Please turn the thermostat down. Please save gasoline by using common sense in determining speed, maintenance, and usage for your automobile.

Save electricity. Save natural gas. Save jobs, and schools, and public health and safety. Energy equals jobs. If we remember that equation, we are going to provide the leadership in Indianapolis that this country expects. Hoosiers have a high regard for common sense and healthy progress. We have an equally healthy dislike of waste and of governmental control when a strong volunteer effort can get the job done.

We are free men, free to waste and complain, but also free to save energy, save our jobs, and save the strength of our country.

My message tonight is simply that the time for waste and complaint is over. The time for saving and for consideration of others has come. With calmness and confidence, let us get on with it.

Thank you and good night.

EACH HAS A ROLE

We applaud the serious yet calm tone of Mayor Richard G. Lugar's television speech to the community on the energy crisis. It was

a call for the co-operation of every citizen in conserving fuels, and for prudence in doing so.

He laid needed emphasis on the point that the wrong kinds of conservation measures could disrupt the economy. Much of the necessary savings can be accomplished at no greater cost than a relatively small degree of personal comfort and convenience. Thoughtful selectivity can minimize the kinds of cutbacks that would result in production, transport and commercial losses, which translate into reduced individual earnings and loss of jobs.

As he said, each conservation measure to be taken by both business and governmental agencies must be approached with prudence. "We must not create unemployment inadvertently," he said, "by adopting measures which disrupt jobs and production."

There was also a welcome expression of opposition to government controls and of confidence that the problem can be met with voluntary action. He promised the city would take a leadership role by making substantial savings in its own energy consumption while maintaining essential services.

He summed up the situation well in a single sentence: "The time for saving and for consideration of others has come."

MISS LAWRA KASSEE BULEN ANNOUNCES CANDIDACY FOR PRESIDENT IN 2012

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 16, 1973, Lawra Kassee, the first child of L. Keith and Carole Buleen—Mr. Buleen is Indiana Republican national committeeman—was born.

Her father is getting her started early. Following is the most imaginative birth announcement I have ever read. Why not?

The notice follows:

DECLARATION OF CANDIDACY FOR THE OFFICE OF PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE YEAR 2012

[Seal of the President of the United States.] I, Lawra Kassee Buleen, do hereby declare my intent to seek the above office in the year indicated.

I swear and affirm that I am a native born U.S. citizen born Friday, November 16, 1973 at the hour of 12:42 a.m.

Further that I will be over thirty-five (35) years of age before such election and assumption of office.

That I weighed Seven pounds Fifteen ounces at birth and was Twenty-One inches long and am a resident of Marion County, State of Indiana, residing presently at 700 North Alabama Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204 with my proud parents Carole and Keith Buleen.

Whereas: I have set my foot the 16th day of November, 1973.

[Seal of Indiana.]

SLEEP GENTLY, DEAR SOLDIER

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, we recently marked Veterans Day, a day of great

pride for many of us, as well as a day of sadness.

Both feelings were evident at the ceremonies in which I participated at the Bethesda-Chevy Chase War Memorial. Dr. Melville A. Taff, Jr., president of the Lewis B. Hershey Sertoma Club of Bethesda-Chevy Chase, was the master of ceremonies.

Mrs. William H. Dowling, of 5713 Huntington Parkway, Bethesda, expressed many of our feelings in a touching poem which she wrote. I would like to share it with you:

SLEEP GENTLY, DEAR SOLDIER

(By Louise L. Dowling)

Sleep gently, dear soldier
The battle has been won
May you find the peace you fought for
In the calm of setting sun
May the moon and stars and winds and rain
A silent vigil keep
And in the hush of twilight, may you rest
In peaceful sleep.

The roar of guns and cannon
Have been silenced, thanks to you
A hush has fallen o'er the earth
As you sleep beneath the dew
And while we struggle still, for peace
Dear soldier, do you know
Old Glory soars because of you
And we thank you for it so.

Now you are safe with Him, above
A hero, gallant, true
So lay your head upon His breast
And rest—dear soldier—do.

LYNN ROSELLINI: AN OUTSTANDING JOURNALIST

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, today, November 30, a highly talented young journalist will be honored for her dedication and devotion to the art of reporting the news "like it is." She is Ms. Lynn Rosellini of Newsday who will receive the 1973 Front Page Award of the New York Newswomen's Club for outstanding journalistic achievement at the club's annual award ceremony to be held in the Hotel Biltmore, New York City.

Ms. Rosellini is being cited for the best news story of the year written by a metropolitan-based woman journalist. The topic of her prize-winning article, which appeared in Newsday on May 22, 1973, was the arraignment of former Attorney General John Mitchell and former Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans—a story that, by necessity, was written under the pressure of deadline.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct privilege to commend Ms. Rosellini to you and to my colleagues as a reporter of exemplary merit whose editorial ability justly deserves our praise and recognition.